MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1961

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

HARRY R. SHEPPARD, California, *Chairman*

ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Florida
JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Mississippi
CHARLES RAPER JONAS, North Carolina
MELVIN R. LAIRD, Wisconsin

FRANK SANDERS, *Staff Assistant to the Subcommittee*

PART I

Department of the Army

Department of the Navy

Printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
53984 WASHINGTON : 1960

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri, *Chairman*

GEORGE H. MAHON, Texas
HARRY R. SHEPPARD, California
ALBERT THOMAS, Texas
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio
W. F. NORRELL, Arkansas
JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Mississippi
GEORGE W. ANDREWS, Alabama
JOHN J. ROONEY, New York
J. VAUGHAN GARY, Virginia
JOHN E. FOGARTY, Rhode Island
ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Florida
PRINCE H. PRESTON, Georgia
OTTO E. PASSMAN, Louisiana
LOUIS C. RABAUT, Michigan
SIDNEY R. YATES, Illinois
FRED MARSHALL, Minnesota
JOHN J. RILEY, South Carolina
JOE L. EVINS, Tennessee
JOHN F. SHELLEY, California
EDWARD P. BOLAND, Massachusetts
DON MAGNUSON, Washington
WILLIAM H. NATCHER, Kentucky
DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania
WINFIELD K. DENTON, Indiana
TOM STEED, Oklahoma
HUGH Q. ALEXANDER, North Carolina
ALFRED E. SANTANGELO, New York
JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, New Mexico
GEORGE E. SHIPLEY, Illinois

JOHN TABER, New York
BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa
H. CARL ANDERSEN, Minnesota
WALT HORAN, Washington
GORDON CANFIELD, New Jersey
IVOR D. FENTON, Pennsylvania
GERALD R. FORD, JR., Michigan
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, New York
FRANK T. BOW, Ohio
CHARLES RAPER JONAS, North Carolina
MELVIN R. LAIRD, Wisconsin
ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, Michigan
GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, California
JOHN J. RHODES, Arizona
JOHN R. PILLION, New York
PHIL WEAVER, Nebraska
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, Ohio
KEITH THOMSON, Wyoming
ROBERT H. MICHEL, Illinois
SILVIO O. CONTE, Massachusetts

KENNETH SPRANKLE, *Clerk and Staff Director*

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

97
3888
A88b
2v2no.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1961

MONDAY, MARCH 21, 1960.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

WITNESSES

HON. DEWEY SHORT, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY (MANPOWER, PERSONNEL, AND RESERVE FORCES)
MAJ. GEN. L. E. SEEMAN, DIRECTOR OF INSTALLATIONS, OFFICE, DIRECTOR OF INSTALLATIONS, ODCSLOG
MAJ. GEN. E. F. COOK, DEPUTY CHIEF, SIGNAL OFFICER, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF SIGNAL OFFICER
MAJ. GEN. D. W. TRAUB, DIRECTOR OF ARMY BUDGET, OFFICE, COMPTROLLER OF THE ARMY
REAR ADM. F. O'BEIRNE, DIRECTOR, J–3, JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF
COL. G. L. EVANS, JR., CHIEF, CONSTRUCTION DIVISION, OFFICE, DIRECTOR OF INSTALLATIONS, ODCSLOG
COL. R. D. McCARTY, CHIEF, FAMILY HOUSING OFFICE, OFFICE, DIRECTOR OF INSTALLATIONS, ODCSLOG
COL. R. W. MUTH, COMMANDING OFFICER, CHEMICAL CORPS ENGINEERING COMMAND, ARMY CHEMICAL CENTER, MARYLAND
COL. J. C. PENNINGTON, ACTING ASSISTANT QUARTERMASTER GENERAL FOR ADMINISTRATION, THE QUARTERMASTER GENERAL
COL. G. P. SAMPSON, CHIEF, ARMY COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE DIVISION, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF SIGNAL OFFICER
COL. J. R. TROTH, CHIEF, INSTALLATIONS DIVISION, CHIEF OF TRANSPORTATION
COL. C. F. VORDER-BRUEGGE, CHIEF, RESEARCH DIVISION, U.S. ARMY, MEDICAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND; OFFICE, THE SURGEON GENERAL
COL. W. O. WYATT, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF, G–4, ARMY SECURITY AGENCY
LT. COL. F. W. HASTINGS, CHIEF, MEDICAL FACILITIES BRANCH, OFFICE, THE SURGEON GENERAL
LT. COL. C. E. HOWARD, AIR DEFENSE OPERATIONS DIVISION, OFFICE, DIRECTOR OF AIR DEFENSE AND SPECIAL WEAPONS, ODCSOPS
LT. COL. L. C. LEE, CHIEF, AIR DEFENSE BRANCH, CONSTRUCTION DIVISION, OFFICE, DIRECTOR OF INSTALLATIONS, ODCSLOG
LT. COL. L. R. MOORE, OFFICE, DIRECTOR OF ARMY BUDGET, OFFICE, COMPTROLLER OF THE ARMY

BENJAMIN KELT, CHIEF, ESTIMATING BRANCH, OFFICE, ASSISTANT FOR ARMY CONSTRUCTION; OFFICE, CHIEF OF ENGINEERS FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

H. B. NORWOOD, CHIEF, PROGRAM AND PLANNING BRANCH, OFFICE, ARMY CONSTRUCTION DIVISION; OFFICE, CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

H. D. VAN KUREN, CHIEF, SERVICES AND INSTALLATIONS OFFICE, OFFICE, CHIEF OF ORDNANCE

L. A. WESTENBERGER, CHIEF, PUBLIC WORKS PLANNING BRANCH, CONSTRUCTION DIVISION, OFFICE, DIRECTOR OF INSTALLATIONS, ODCSLOG

C. E. LEMMER, PROGRAM AND PLANNING BRANCH, ARMY CONSTRUCTION DIVISION, OFFICE, CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

Program and financing

	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate
Program by activities:			
Direct obligations:			
1. Public work construction	$214,048,898	$242,000,000	$181,600,000
2. Minor construction	5,066,473	5,000,000	3,700,000
3. Planning	11,464,764	15,000,000	12,000,000
4. Supporting activities	9,234,270	10,000,000	8,200,000
5. Advance land rental, Ryukyu Islands			6,500,000
Total direct obligations	239,814,405	272,000,000	212,000,000
Reimbursable obligations:			
4. Supporting activities	4,794,321	8,000,000	6,000,000
Total obligations	244,608,726	280,000,000	218,000,000
Financing:			
Unobligated balance brought forward	−114,878,376	−105,063,971	−96,696,271
Advances and reimbursements from non-Federal sources (69 Stat. 646)	−4,794,321	−8,000,000	−6,000,000
Unobligated balance carried forward	105,063,971	96,696,271	93,696,271
Appropriation (new obligational authority)	230,000,000	263,632,300	209,000,000

Object classification

	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate
Total number of permanent positions	5,304	4,878	4,711
Full-time equivalent of all other positions	160	117	105
Average number of all employees	5,156	4,744	4,574
Number of employees at end of year	5,205	4,735	4,549
Average GS grade and salary	7.8 $6,345	7.8 $6,354	7.8 $6,375
Average salary of ungraded positions	$4,218	$4,044	$4,140
Personal service obligations:			
Permanent positions	$28,091,620	$26,845,284	$26,495,709
Positions other than permanent	172,427	143,000	143,000
Other personal services	2,332,164	1,868,716	1,668,291
Total personal service obligations	30,596,211	28,857,000	28,307,000
Direct obligations:			
01 Personal services	26,398,658	24,852,000	24,482,000
02 Travel	1,116,636	1,300,000	1,000,000
03 Transportation of things	3,171,258	3,200,000	3,000,000
04 Communication services	215,325	225,000	190,000
05 Rents and utility services	205,275	210,000	6,700,000
06 Printing and reproduction	174,812	180,000	170,000
07 Other contractual services	41,687,716	45,000,000	40,000,000
Services performed by other agencies	50,000	50,000	50,000
Labor contracts with foreign governments [1]	282,650	329,000	329,000
08 Supplies and materials	5,855,183	6,000,000	5,500,000
09 Equipment	5,591,258	5,700,000	5,200,000
10 Lands and structures	151,063,684	177,248,180	119,161,000
11 Grants, subsidies, and contributions	1,533,311	1,675,000	1,643,000
13 Refunds, awards, and indemnities	41,219	45,000	40,000
15 Taxes and assessments	33,713	34,000	35,000
Total direct obligations	237,420,698	266,048,180	207,500,000
Reimbursable obligations:			
01 Personal services	4,197,553	4,005,000	3,825,000
02 Travel	50,000	50,000	45,000
07 Other contractual services	286,563	3,695,000	1,890,000
11 Grants, subsidies, and contributions	260,205	250,000	240,000
Total reimbursable obligations	4,794,321	8,000,000	6,000,000
Total, Army	242,215,019	274,048,180	213,500,000
ALLOCATION ACCOUNTS			
Total number of permanent positions	16	13	6
Full-time equivalent of all other positions	2	2	2
Average number of all employees	15	11	6
Number of employees at end of year	10	4	4
Average GS grade and salary	10.0 $8,547	10.7 $9,233	8.2 $6,771
01 Personal services:			
Permanent positions	$112,221	$72,700	$19,900
Positions other than permanent	9,108	9,100	9,100
Other personal services	1,158	1,200	1,000
Total personal services	122,487	83,000	30,000
02 Travel	11,370	11,200	10,000
04 Communication services	210	1,000	1,000
05 Rents and utility services	2,423	3,000	3,000
06 Printing and reproduction	36		
07 Other contractual services	100,110	1,326,714	1,000
Services performed by other agencies	34,075	70,000	70,000
08 Supplies and materials	11,735	12,000	12,000
10 Lands and structures	2,103,740	4,440,456	4,372,000
11 Grants, subsidies, and contributions	7,293	4,450	1,000
15 Taxes and assessments	228		
Total allocation accounts	2,393,707	5,951,820	4,500,000
Total obligations	244,608,726	280,000,000	218,000,000
Obligations are distributed as follows:			
Army	242,215,019	274,048,180	213,500,000
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization	100,379	94,293	
Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads	2,194,328	4,568,456	4,500,000
Atomic Energy Commission	80,196	254,804	
Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines	17,595	16,567	
Panama Canal	1,205	1,017,700	
Department of Commerce, National Bureau of Standards	4		

[1] Average number persons: 1959, 114; 1960, 183; 1961, 183.

"For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Army as [authorized by section 102 of the Act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155), by section 102 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (Public Law 534), sections 101 and 102 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (Public Law 161), sections 101 and 102 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (Public Law 968), the Act of August 30, 1957 (Public Law 85-241), the Act of August 20, 1958 (Public Law 85-685)] *currently authorized in military public works or military construction acts, in sections 2673 and 2675 of title 10 United States Code*, and such additional projects as may be authorized by law during the [first] *second* session of the Eighty-sixth Congress, to remain available until expended, [$263,632,300, including $1,700,000 to be used only for the purchase of foreign currencies to construct military facilities (except housing and community facilities) for the Army Security Agency, location 12] *$209,000,000*."

EXPLANATION OF LANGUAGE CHANGES

(1) To simplify the inclusion of the military construction authorization acts into the appropriation act.

(2) To authorize construction of additional projects in fiscal year 1961 pending approval of the military construction authorization bill by the 2d session of the 86th Congress.

REIMBURSABLE ACTIVITIES

SOURCE OF REIMBURSEMENTS

Sponsors, Capehart housing: Actual, fiscal year 1959	$4,794,321
Estimate:	
Fiscal year 1960	8,000,000
Fiscal year 1961	6,000,000

DESCRIPTION OF REIMBURSABLE WORK

The reimbursable activity under this appropriation represents collections from sponsors of Capehart housing and is to cover preliminary planning and Government inspection costs applicable thereto.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We have with us this morning the Honorable Dewey Short, Assistant Secretary of the Army. It is my understanding, Mr. Secretary, that you have a statement you wish to present to the committee.

Mr. SHORT. Very brief, and knowing how busy you are, I shall make it brief.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will not interrupt you until you have completed your statement.

GENERAL STATEMENT OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY FOR MANPOWER, PERSONNEL, AND RESERVE FORCES

Mr. SHORT. This will give you, broad brush, the big picture broken down into four categories. General Seeman and other witnesses following me will discuss line items with you.

We are requesting for fiscal year 1961 appropriations totaling $209.1 million. This amount is comprised of $135.9 million in new authorizations for fiscal year 1961 and $73.2 million in authorizations granted in fiscal year 1960 and prior years—included in this latter amount is $30.4 million of general authorization.

The request is the smallest the Army has presented for military construction in the last several years, and represents a program which has been developed under the most rigid budgetary guidance. We consider it a very austere program, one that has been developed as a result of

exhaustive and critical reviews seeking to defer all but our most urgent requirements.

These are critical times for the United States in which our leadership and prestige as a nation are being seriously challenged, militarily, politically, technically, and economically. A strong, modern, capable Army, deployed in key locations around the world, and with adequate combat reserves in the United States, constitutes not only a most valuable military asset to the Nation but also pays dividends in terms of coalescing our various mutual security alliances and exerting a considerable psychological influence on uncommitted areas of the world. Such Army forces require a proper balance between men, materiel, and facilities—and the Army's fiscal year 1961 military construction program which is before you has been developed with that balance in mind. It has been drafted to provide the facilities necessary to develop, test, store, maintain, and operate the wide variety of equipment and materiel which characterizes a modern fighting force; it provides academic and training facilities essential to preparing our officers and men for their roles within this force; and it includes facilities to improve the working and living environment of our personnel and thereby contribute to the Army's ability to attract and retain high caliber personnel.

The appropriations which we are requesting will support construction activities in four major categories:

First, $43.2 million of the total is for construction support of the Army's surface-to-air missile program. As you are aware, the bulk of the construction requirement for Army units deployed in support of the Department of Defense master air defense plan has been accomplished, or is currently under construction, with prior years' appropriations. The additional funds being requested this year are primarily for three purposes: some $14.3 million are for facilities, some in the United States and some in base rights areas, necessary to support research, development, and testing of the NIKE–ZEUS antimissile missile system. I'm sure I need not emphasize to you gentlemen the importance of this ZEUS program to the security of the United States. Then, $18.3 million are primarily for facilities required to effect improvements—enabled by technological advancements—in the capability of units deployed under control of Cincnorad in defense of military targets (principally SAC bases) and metropolitan areas. The bulk of other requirements in this category are for living and logistic facilities necessary to deploy HAWK units in oversea areas for improving the air defense of our forces in the field.

The second category I would like to mention is construction in support of Army forces in oversea base rights areas.

These forces comprise approximately 35 percent of the Army strength. Construction accomplished through prior years' MCA funds, local currencies, surplus commodity funds, and under rental guarantee arrangements, along with that programed against the $32 million approved for fiscal year 1960, provide most of the operational, logistic support, and administrative facilities (including family housing) required to meet our commitments in these areas. We are well along toward completion of the line of communications, France, a program initiated in fiscal year 1951 and totaling about $300 million.

Nevertheless, there still remain some additional requirements, the most urgent of which are included in this request. The $23.2 million requested for projects in this category includes approximately $5 million for construction support of Army forces in Korea, primarily in maintenance, storage, communication, and other logistic support facilities; approximately $9 million for Europe, almost all of which is for improved storage facilities and dispersal of our logistic complex in the immediate support of the 7th Army in Germany. The remaining $9 million will provide operational and support facilities required for Army Security Agency and signal overseas operations at 14 stations around the globe.

Construction at installations within the United States, its possessions, and Okinawa constitutes the third major category and totals $109.2 million. This category consists of the highest priority items selected from requirements existing at our 128 permanent installations and thus is frequently termed "permanent plant." A considerable portion of the inventory of real property at these installations is aged and obsolete. Many of the existing facilities are nearly 20 years old; some were built during World War I and many were built during World War II using light frame construction intended for emergency use based upon a design life of 5 to 15 years. Such structures do not provide effective operational, academic and logistic support facilities from which we may derive maximum benefit from our men, nor do they provide working and living conditions commensurate with the standards which our personnel might find in civilian life. While most of our program, including the projects to which we assign the highest priorities, is in the operational and training segment, we are concerned with the provision of adequate housing and community facilities. We consider that this segment of our program has a direct bearing on morale among our military people, and consequently on our ability to retain in the service those trained people—the leaders and technicians—in whom we have the biggest investment and on whom we depend as the base of our present strength and any expansion if it proves necessary.

The fourth and last category for which we are requesting $30.4 million consists of those items covered by general authorization. This total will provide for advance planning and design so that we can give you good cost estimates for minor construction, for access roads, for off-site utilities in support of the Capehart housing program—which has been so beneficial in satisfying a large portion of our family housing requirements, for rehabilitation of substandard housing and for land rental in the Ryukyu Islands.

Gentlemen, this completes my summation of the "Military construction, Army," appropriation request for fiscal year 1961. General Seeman, who will follow me, will present details of the program to you and is prepared to fully justify each line item.

Again I wish to state my appreciation for the opportunity to present to you this most important program. I assure you that all the Army witnesses will cooperate to the fullest in answering questions and supplying any information that you may desire.

Thank you.

The total is $209 million, the smallest in many years. It is broken down into the four categories.

The requests we have had from the field have been carefully, minutely and objectively considered. We have cut and slashed and we think we are almost down to the bone. It is a modest request. It is a meager request, and I might say that the House Armed Services Committee accepted this program with very little questioning or much debate. Mr. Vinson, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, said he thought it was one of the most modest programs which had been presented in recent years. He did chop $7.5 million off that $17.5 million contingency fund, to which we offered no objection.

VALIDITY OF PROGRAM AND REQUIREMENTS

Mr. SHEPPARD. I can obviously anticipate the ways in which your presentation would have been acceptable. I cannot see with logic and, in fact, I am somewhat astounded, that they even had the temerity to take the $7 million off. But, I think I can understand that probability.

Do you have any items in this program which have not been fully approved by all reviewing agencies?

Mr. SHORT. Everyone of these have been approved by all of the reviewing agencies and have run the whole long, tortuous gamut, Mr. Chairman.

I think General Seeman will point out that we have made one or two minor changes.

General SEEMAN. We have some changes to suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, but they have been approved in the meantime by the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. SHORT. But, as you gentlemen so well realize, you have got to have a certain amount of flexibility and elasticity in working out your programs. You learn after you send up your first request, that other conditions arise or changes take place where it is necessary, perhaps, to put some particular item above another.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We can understand that insofar as the item of the percentage of the budget pertains, because you are obviously delving into an unknown field and the missiles aspect of it, and you take a percentage of your budget dollars and break them down. We have a tendency to be forgiving, as it were, in the unknown factor, but in the known factor we are very unforgiving.

Mr. SHORT. You should be. After just sending in my income tax payment, I appreciate what you are saying.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I say that apparently you are no more excluded from sending it in in your present position than you were as a Member of Congress; is that correct?

Mr. SHORT. Not a bit.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any items which will not be placed under contract in fiscal year 1961?

General SEEMAN. We have one, Mr. Chairman, which is the hospital at Fort Leonard Wood; we are asking for authorization, but we are not including at the present time in our funding plans.

Mr. SHORT. While you are on that subject, of course, one of our direst needs at many of these permanent post and installations—I mean the large and well-established ones and which will continue with a large population such as Fort Leonard Wood—we have about 30,000

population on that post. We have 2,000 of them in fine new Capehart housing and also have 2 or 3 new barracks. They have rehabilitated others, but the hospital there is just about to cave in. It is really disgraceful. The Secretary, Mr. Brucker and I, were out and saw it recently.

While we would like to put in a request for three hospitals—Fort Leonard Wood, Fort Sill, and Fort Hood in that order of priority—we thought that we could not get them all three this year. So, they decided to ask for only Fort Leonard Wood first, a 400-bed hospital which will cost over $8 million. They chopped it down to 300 beds which will cost a little in excess of $5 million.

They have a heavy workload and have expensive equipment and good personnel, but it is impossible to heat it or cool it in old wooden buildings, and you do actually almost fall through the floor. The radiators and everything else leak, but they need that hospital more than any post I know of.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any other items which will not be placed under contract in 1961?

General SEEMAN. No, sir; all other items in the funding plans are specific and we come to you with the planning far enough along and we think with good estimates and we intend to fund and obligate all of them.

Mr. SHORT. If I might interpolate, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of these gentlemen from the Pentagon, the Congress, and particularly the House Armed Services Committee as well as the Appropriations Committee have been fighting a desperate battle to narrow the gap between authorizations and appropriations and void these big carryovers, and I think that the Congress—these two committees in particular, the Appropriations Committee and the Armed Services Committee—have accomplished a great deal in that respect. We have narrowed that gap and we are asking for only what we are going to use to meet our minimum needs.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you anticipate that any of these items will not be fully funded in fiscal year 1961?

General SEEMAN. Not at this time.

Mr. SHORT. That is up, of course, to the committee.

General SEEMAN. We have no knowledge but what we intend to fully fund them.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Generally speaking, to what extent is the program based on completed plans and specifications as against those of a different type?

General SEEMAN. Mr. Chairman, as you know, we have been improving year to year, with the authority which was given by the Congress for advanced planning, and I think we are better this year than we have been in the past.

Could I ask Mr. Norwood to comment on that?

Mr. NORWOOD. Right now the plans are complete or to the preliminary stage, and there is 85 percent completion of the preliminary plans.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Wait a minute. I am not getting that. You say that out of your total plans 85 percent are what?

Mr. NORWOOD. Out of the total items in the program 50 percent of the items are either 100 percent complete or up to 85 percent complete

in the preliminary stages. The balance are less than 85 percent complete to the preliminary stages.

DISPOSAL OF REAL PROPERTY

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would insert in the record at this point the real property disposal or inactivation action taken or contemplated by the Army in fiscal 1960 and fiscal 1961.

General SEEMAN. We have that data and will provide it for the record.

(The information requested follows:)

Disposal accomplishments, Department of the Army—1st and 2d quarters fiscal year 1960

Name and location	*Date disposal completed*
California: Pillar Point Military Reservation	Sept. 5, 1959.
Maryland: Fort Carroll	Aug. 5, 1959.
Michigan: Melvindale Forge Plant	Aug. 17, 1959.
New Jersey:	
Army Reserve Training Center, Montclair	July 6, 1959.
Carteret storage activity	Nov. 13, 1959.
North Carolina: Fort Bragg housing site	Aug. 6, 1959.
Texas: Fort San Jacinto Military Reservation	Sept. 24, 1959.
Washington:	
Camp Hayden	Aug. 21, 1959.
Seattle troop training site	July 17, 1959.
West Virginia: Morgantown Ordnance Works	July 15, 1959.

EXCESS INSTALLATIONS IN PROCESS FOR DISPOSAL, DURING FISCAL YEAR 1960–61

Arkansas:
- Maumelle Ordnance Works.[1]
- Southwestern Proving Grounds.[1]

California:
- Camp Stoneman.[1]
- Los Angeles Defense Area NIKE Battery (Belsa Chica).[1]
- Mussel Rock Military Reservation.[1]
- Owl 4X Plant.[1]
- Reservation Point, Los Angeles Harbor.

Colorado: Fort Logan.[1]

Illinois:
- Green River Ordnance Plant.[1]
- Rockford Ordnance Plant.[1]
- St. Louis Chemical Plant.[1]

Maine: Fort Madison.

Maryland: Curtis Bay storage activity.

Massachusetts:
- Fort Independence.
- Fort Winthrop.

Minnesota: Gopher Ordnance Works.[1]

Mississippi: Gulf Ordnance Plant.

Missouri: Rosecrans Field (National Guard).

Nebraska: Nebraska Ordnance Works.[1]

New Hampshire: Fort Dearborn.[1]

New Jersey:
- Belle Mead General Depot.[1]
- Caven Point Army Terminal.

New York:
- Niskayuna Ordnance Center.[1]
- Rochester Ordnance Storage Facility.[1]
- Fort H. G. Wright.[1]

[1] Reported to General Services Administration for disposal

Pennsylvania:
Cheroke Ordnance Works.[1]
Keystone Ordnance Works.[1]
Philadelphia Army Supply Base.
Schuylkill Arsenal.[1]
Letterkenny Ordnance Depot (Susquehanna Subdepot).[1]
Rhode Island: Fort Church.[1]
Texas:
Cactus Ordnance Plant.[1]
San Jacinto Ammonia Works.[1]
San Jacinto Ordnance Depot.
Virginia:
Battery Cove Military Reservation.[1]
Fort John Custis.[1]
Washington:
ACS Maryville Recreation Site.[1]
Fort Flagler.[1]
Pasco Engineer Depot.[1]
West Virginia:
Army Reserve Training Center, Morgantown.[1]
West Virginia Ordnance Works.[1]

The following installations have been or are approved for inactivation during fiscal year 1960 on the dates indicated (no installations have been approved for inactivation during fiscal year 1961):

Branch U.S. Disciplinary Barracks, Calif	July 31, 1959
Camp Gary, Tex	Sept. 30, 1959
Army and Navy Hospital, Ark	Dec. 1, 1959
San Jacinto Ordinance Depot, Tex	June 30, 1960

CONTRACT AWARDS

Mr. SHEPPARD. What contracts were awarded in fiscal year 1960 on other than an advertised competitive basis, and why?

General SEEMAN. I have that information, Mr. Chairman, but I cannot put my finger on it. However, I believe well over 95 percent of the total are awarded under competitive bidding.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Please place the accurate figure in the record when the transcript comes down to you.

(The information requested follows:)

The correct figures are 95.7 percent advertised; 4.3 percent negotiated. Of the 4.3 percent negotiated, 3.5 percent was with competition and 0.8 percent without competition.

Mr. SHORT. We are trying to carry out the will of the Congress in having free and competitive bidding on all of our projects. It is only in these new and unexplored fields where you are almost compelled to negotiate.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you contemplate any further action in this respect in fiscal year 1960 or fiscal year 1961? Are you intensifying that aspect?

Mr. SHORT. We are intensifying it, but there is one project about which I know in particular down at Redstone on this photography that falls under logistics where they may have to let out by contract that particular project. It is now being done by a half dozen or more contractors.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would insert in the record a statement showing any contracts not awarded to the low bidder and show the

[1] Reported to General Services Administration for disposal.

reasons therefor. Insert that in the record because that will be compatible with the analysis which you are going to make and insert in the record on other questions.

(The information requested follows:)

Of five awards made to other than the low responsive bidder in fiscal year 1959 and two in fiscal year 1960, prior to March 1, 1960, four were made because of error in bid; one failed to acknowledge an addendum to the invitation to bid which increased the cost of the work; one failed to execute the required performance and payment bond; and one failed to qualify after a preaward survey by the district engineer.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you have any outstanding cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts?

I want the answer on that now, if you can give it to me.

Mr. NORWOOD. Yes, sir. We have three architect-engineer contracts with a CPFF, and two construction contracts. However, the construction contracts are in the Air Force program and not in the Army, if that makes any difference to the committee. There are those two.

Mr. SHEPPARD. My question was more addressed to the Army at the moment because we will pick that up in detail when the Air Force appears before us, because your function purely is as the agent of the Air Force and you are subjected to many regulatory conditions which might not prevail in the Army?

Mr. NORWOOD. That is correct. Regarding the Army there are two A. & E. contracts, CPFF, and no construction.

JOINT UTILIZATION OF RESERVE FACILITIES

Mr. SHEPPARD. What have you done to insure joint use of facilities for the Reserve components, including the National Guard?

General SEEMAN. This is very closely monitored in the Army staff by the Assistant Chief of Staff for Reserve Components to make sure that both the Reserves and the guard use jointly facilities to the maximum extent possible. This applies not only to facilities for new construction in fact, but the facilities which may exist on the ground already.

Mr. SHORT. We are jointly using the same posts or installations.

General SEEMAN. And, in addition, the Department of Defense monitors this very closely.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When the transcript comes down to you will you please insert into the record a detailed response to that question?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And also insert in the record a list of the States where common or joint use is not followed.

Mr. JONAS. Are you asking for a list of the joint-use facilities?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes; having to do with the joint use of facilities for the Reserve components, including the National Guard.

Mr. JONAS. You are asking for a list——

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes, sir; an explanatory list giving the detailed items and I wish at this point in the record you would insert a list of States which have refused to allow joint use of facilities and show the guard and Reserve armories proposed for these States in this program. I would like to have that in detail for the record, if you will please.

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman.

(The information requested follows:)

The optimum joint utilization of Reserve facilities is insured as follows:

The Department of the Army supports the policy of joint construction and/or joint utilization wherever legally feasible and practicable. This policy is clearly outlined in chapter 133, title 10 United States Code, Department of Defense Directives and Department of the Army Regulations. The joint utilization aspects of Reserve component facilities projects are reviewed at the local level by the State Reserve forces facilities boards composed of representatives of all the Reserve components. They are again reviewed at military department levels and by the Department of Defense. Projects which appear to have joint utilization possibilities that have not been completely explored are returned to the initiating agency for further consideration. In the event further study supports construction of separate facilities the project is again submitted through channels substantiated by the additional justification data. On the other hand, joint construction is proposed in those instances where restudy reveals the feasibility of such construction.

In order to promptly provide the information requested, the replies to questionnaries sent to each of the States and to Puerto Rico by the National Guard Bureau on July 28, 1959 were analyzed. All States except Alaska, Kentucky, Missouri, and Virginia replied to that questionnaire. Illinois and Maryland, whose construction programs were completed, did not answer the questions specifically.

Inasmuch as the questionnaire was directed to the question of joint utilization specifically, and to joint Federal-State construction only incidentally, not all of the replies disposed of the question of joint construction with clarity and certainty.

One or two of the States indicated that their legislatures would probably consider amendments to such of their State laws as precluded or cast doubt on the authority to engage in joint construction or joint utilization. A number of legislatures have met, are meeting, or will meet in the near future. Accordingly, it may be that some of the laws in effect when the various States replied to the July 28, 1959, questionnaire have since been amended.

As of July 28, 1959, and based on replies from the responding States and Puerto Rico, the following tabulation is submitted:

A. States whose laws authorize joint Federal-State construction and joint utilization by the Army National Guard and Reserve components:

California	Massachusetts	Rhode Island
Connecticut	Minnesota	South Dakota
Delaware	Montana	Tennessee
Florida	New Mexico	West Virginia
Hawaii	New York	
Indiana	Pennsylvania	

B. States whose laws authorize joint utilization by the Army National Guard and Reserve components (replies are not sufficiently clear as to whether joint construction is also legally possible):

Alabama	Maine	Oklahoma
Arkansas	Nebraska	Oregon
Idaho	Nevada	Utah
Kansas	New Jersey	Washington
Louisiana	North Dakota	

C. States whose laws preclude joint utilization:

Arizona	North Carolina [1]	Vermont
Colorado	Ohio	Wisconsin
Georgia	Puerto Rico	Wyoming
Michigan	South Carolina	
Mississippi	Texas [1]	

[1] Have agreed to future joint construction.

D. States whose laws are ambiguous (doubt expressed by the attorney general of the State as to authority for joint utilization):

Iowa New Hampshire

E. Expressed no views since construction program was complete:

Illinois Maryland

F. Replies not received:

Alaska Missouri Virgina
Kentucky

Recapitulation.—Forty-six States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico furnished replies: 16 States authorize joint construction and joint utilization; 14 more authorize joint utilization; in 2 the law is too ambiguous to warrant an authoritative answer; 2 did not answer since their programs were complete; 13 cannot permit utilization by other Reserve components under the laws in effect on or about August 1959.

National Guard facilities proposed for funding in fiscal year 1961 for States listed in par. C

Location	Type	Construction cost
Arizona: Casa Grande [1]	1-U (s) MVSB.	108
Colorado: Cortez [1]	1-Unit (s)	114
Georgia:		
Atlanta	2-U-Plus	132
Eatonton	1-Unit	90
Marietta	1-Unit	90
Gainesville	1-Unit	90
Michigan: Ishpeming	1-U-P, MVSB.	280
Mississippi:		
De Kalb [1]	1-Unit (s)	63
Carthage [1]	1-Unit (s)	63
Mendenhall [1]	1-Unit (s)	63
Jackson [1]	3-U-Plus	232
Eupora [1]	1-Unit	63
North Carolina:		
Belmont	1-Unit	98
Greensboro	4-U-Plus	357
Hendersonville	1-Unit	120
Laurinburg	1-Unit	105
Lincolnton	1-Unit	95
Rockingham	1-Unit	98
Shallotte	1-Unit	95
Wallace	1-Unit	95
Ohio:		
Elyria	1-U-Plus	160
Greenville	1-U, MVSB	165
Lancaster	1-U-MVSB	160
Caldwell	1-U-Plus	135
Puerto Rico:		
Sabana Grande [1]	1-Unit	63
Gurabo [1]	1-U-Plus	70
South Carolina:		
Jonesville	1-Unit	99
Chesterfield	1-Unit	99
Johnston	1-Unit	99
Pacolet Mills	1-Unit-Plus	99
Texas:		
Texarkana	2-Unit	153
Cuero	1-Unit (s)	93
Dallas No. 5	4-U-Plus	351
Levelland [1]	1-Unit (s)	85
Brownsville [1]	1-Unit (s)	85
Vermont: Vergennes [1]	1-Unit (s)	135
Wisconsin: Oshkosh	2-U-P, MVSB.	235
Wyoming:		
Lovell	1-Unit	142
Cody	1-Unit	142
MINOR CONSTRUCTION		
South Carolina:		
Saluda [1]	Expansion	23
Gaffney [1]	Expansion	18
NONARMORY		
Georgia: Fort Stewart [1]	Training facility.	423
Mississippi:		
Camp Shelby	CFMS	165
Do. [1]	Training facility.	423
North Carolina: Camp Butner	WH	175

[1] Projects included in fiscal year 1961 authorization.

Army Reserve facilities proposed for funding in fiscal year 1961 for States listed in par. C

Location	Size facility		Remarks
	ARC	MS	
Colorado: Boulder	1	2	Joint with Navy.
Michigan: Detroit No. 1	3	3	
Mississippi: Tupelo	1(M)	1	
North Carolina: Winston-Salem		3	Center constructed.
Ohio:			
Akron No. 2	3	3	
Cleveland	5	4	
Mount Vernon	1(M)	1	
Toledo	1 expansion		Do.
Texas:			
Odessa	1(M)	1	
Lubbock	1 expansion	1	Do.
San Antonio	3	3	
Yoakum	1(M)	1	

AWARD OF ARCHITECT ENGINEER CONTRACTS

Mr. SHEPPARD. How do you handle the award of A. & E. contracts? How do you select the A. & E. people?

General SEEMAN. In general, sir, this is a professional arrangement where the contracting officer will select from the architect-engineer firms available in the area those which are competent to design the structure in question. Then he will discuss with them what their workload is and what their capabilities are. Based on that, he will select what he believes is the most capable one and then enter into a discussion with him on the scope of the contract and the fee and the various things to arrive at a contract. If he cannot reach a workable agreement with the No. 1 man within the limits of our negotiations, he goes to the next one as a professional approach.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Well, of course, the necessary steps are taken to guarantee that the Government gets a good job at the most economical price, and that responsibility is definitely on your back, as it were?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And, it depends very largely upon the reviewing officer who is interviewing those people as to the type of service he gets. I presume you gentlemen know equally as well as myself, and perhaps better, that when you have trouble and start running in change orders, invariably that goes back to a misapprehension on the nonconclusive aspect of a definite understanding of your A. & E. people to first know what is wanted and the kind of a job that is to be done?

General SEEMAN. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And, if they do not turn out a job, you can eliminate a lot of the change orders, once you have given them a criterion procedure, or there is something wrong with the setup.

You might tell us whether or not you scrutinize their ability constructionwise from the standpoint of their background and experience as well as their finances and so forth.

Is that a component part of your analysis?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir; that is one of the problems that you compare. The experience and the amount of professional competency

that you can get from an older firm and what you pay for it will be different than what you will get from a younger firm. On the other hand, they have a review of those plans and specifications before they are advertised to determine their completeness.

Second, the followup that is done through the construction and the final report before the A. & E. contract is finally closed and his percentage paid. The contracting officer and the division engineer must give a rating upon that architect engineer as to the quality of his work.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In handling these A. & E. operations are they made to pull out the cost factors for the purpose of determining your ultimate costs? In other words, do they hypothetically set up in New York or Los Angeles—and I will try and be geographically honest about this—and draw a memorandum of the average percentage of the cost factor, or do they actually make a pullout so you know the average percentage costs of your plumbing, your cables, and so forth and so on?

General SEEMAN. In the preliminary stage, Mr. Chairman, they will generally base the cost estimate upon the number of square feet in a similar type building, and we pick them based upon their actual experience as to the type of building we have in the area. They will not make their material takeoff until they have complete specifications, and then we use that and actually extend what the unit cost will be. That is what is used to compare the contractors' bids.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the basis that you have for analyzing your sectional cost factors in the United States so that when you come into your finalization of plans you yourself know that they have not used another percentage, because your cost factors in the United States based upon a four-sectional setup very definitely show a wide line of percentage demarcation.

General SEEMAN. Well, we can only compare it, Mr. Chairman, with other construction that we are getting in that locality.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, am I to assume at this point that the Army Engineers are not subscribers to the so-called materials cost factor throughout the United States so that they themselves can reach in to section so and so and know geographically on A. & E. that the general cost factor is this versus this over here?

Do you have that information available, or do you subscribe to that kind of information?

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Chairman, we have to accept these cost factors in the preliminary stages in the planning, but it is true that before we award a construction contract we will want an estimate based on materials takeoff and labor estimates.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In the final analysis you do make them point it out?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What has been your experience with reference to design deficiencies and your A. & E. work.

Mr. NORWOOD. In answer to that, there is nothing to indicate an abnormal occurrence of design deficiencies. This is in an area which is sometimes difficult to evaluate when the customer or station commander accepts a building as constructed. He can find fault with it, but the question of whether or not it is a fault in the design or a fault in construction can be determined.

We have no abnormal conditions now, Mr. Chairman, in the area in question.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. What would be the effect of handling this A. & E. work on an advertised competitive bid basis just as you do construction contracts?

Mr. NORWOOD. You are speaking of A. & E.?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes, sir.

General SEEMAN. This procedure has been tried in some cases and we have noticed it in various States where some of the engineers and architects, both in Government employ and in private business, have tested this and it is generally unacceptable in the code of professional ethics of the engineering society, because a great difficulty in evaluating the experience that you are buying very obviously is this: As, for example, a man who designed the George Washington Bridge across the upper Hudson River, if he were to bid against another firm of less experience, there would be no way of equating it in pure dollars and cents as well as a lot of experience that is brought into that job. On a routine building it is not quite so significant.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the percentage upon which you value the services of the A. & E. people? Do you use a certain percentage of the total A. & E. involved? Just how do you evaluate those services, and what is the basis on which you can say "All right, Jones and Jones and Jones, we are going to pay so much for this"?

General SEEMAN. At first we have guidelines as to the fee which will be acceptable to the Government and any contracting officer who exceeds that must get the Chief of Engineers' approval and must show that this is a very exceptional piece of work on which very few architect engineers in the area have adequate experience and, of course, as you will appreciate, Mr. Chairman, there is a time factor as to when the using service wants the job which is very important also.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I say that there have been many sins committed under the time factor aspect, if you will go back and check the record.

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir; there is a great possibility of its abuse.

UNOBLIGATED BALANCES

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice that in 1960, despite a reduction in appropriation by Congress in excess of $177 million, that your unobligated balance will stay about the same. By the same token, the balance for fiscal year 1959 is almost $11 million more than estimated last year. Why, please?

General SEEMAN. Our estimated unobligated balance coming out of fiscal year 1959 into 1960, Mr. Chairman, was $105 million. Our estimated balance coming out of this fiscal year is $97 million at this time. That is a reduction of $8 million.

Our estimate for fiscal year 1961 is that it will drop to $70 million. So, there has been a decline in our unobligated balance.

I have a chart of that, Mr. Chairman, which if it be your pleasure can be inserted in the record with my prepared statement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right. We shall be very glad for you to clarify that because there is apparently a difference which we find here. I do

not think it is a large one, but we do find a difference which, perhaps, your answer will clarify.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF MAJ. GEN. L. E. SEEMAN, DIRECTOR OF INSTALLATIONS

I am pleased to be able to appear before this committee again this year to present the Army's fiscal year 1961 MCA appropriation request.

I fully realize your committee has a crowded calendar and I will be as brief as possible in this statement.

For fiscal year 1961 the Army is requesting new appropriations totaling $209,072,000. These new funds will be used to finance our fiscal year 1961 MCA funding plan, copies of which have been furnished to the committee. This funding plan consists of $135,872,000 in appropriations for new authorizations, $42,800,000 in appropriations for prior years' valid authorizations, and $30,400,000 to fund general authorization. The general authorization funding, of course, is required to support our planning, minor construction, access roads, offsite MCA support for Capehart housing, and rehabilitation of substandard housing and advance land rental, Ryukyus Islands. At this time, it is estimated that approximately $97 million will be carried over from fiscal year 1960 into fiscal year 1961. This amount cannot be considered as available for the fiscal year 1961 program. Under the complete funding procedure, some $70 million is required to complete projects now underway, pay the costs of Government inspection and supervision of these projects, and to provide for contingencies. The balance, $27 million, is required to continue planning and support activities until new funds become available, and to accomplish projects approved for execution in fiscal year 1960 but which for various reasons will be incapable of obligation until early in fiscal year 1961.

I shall present first a résumé of the development of this year's construction program; secondly, a summary of the fiscal position with regard to the coming fiscal year, and last a brief of the major construction elements of the program.

The installation planning boards throughout the Army and the system of planning, programing, and critical review established by the Army some years ago was designed to insure that only the most necessary facilities to support our missions and personnel are included. The review pattern within the installations, the major commands, and the Army staff has been most effective. In this connection, the advance planning authority granted us by Congress has been of great value. Installations, master plans and long-range construction programs are under continuing refinement. As a result, there exists greater clarity and accuracy in the evaluation of our construction needs than ever before.

The program before you places major emphasis on those projects which are related to operational requirements contributing to our immediate ability to fight and to support our continuing, long-term missions of national defense. We believe that this program is sound, well-balanced with respect to the Army's tactical and logistical construction needs, and that it represents only those requirements most essential to accomplishment of the Army's important missions.

The overall status of the military construction authorization and appropriation has always been a matter of concern and interest to the committee. Last year we presented a chart which graphically portrayed the status of authorization and funds for the fiscal years 1958, 1959, and 1960. This chart has been brought up to date to reflect the current status and our expected activity for fiscal year 1961.

(Tables in lieu of the chart referred to are as follows:)

Summary, military construction, Army program

[Millions of dollars]

AUTHORIZATION

	Fiscal year 1959	Fiscal year 1960	Fiscal year 1961
Prior years authorization available at beginning of fiscal year	368	316	[1] 204
New authorization in fiscal year	310	188	[2] 158
Deficiency authorization	13	2	[2] 8
General authorization	15	[1] 33	[2] 25
Total authorization	706	539	[1] 395
Less appropriation for fiscal year	−230	−264	[2] −209
Less authorization repealed	−160	[1] −71	[1] −127
Residual unfunded authorization available at end of fiscal year	316	[1] 204	[1] 59

APPROPRIATIONS

Carryover from previous fiscal year	115	105	[1] 97
Appropriation for fiscal year	230	264	[2] 209
Total funds available for obligation	345	369	[1] 306
Less total obligations	−240	[1] −272	[1] −212
Total of committed but unobligated funds available for carryover to new fiscal year	105	97	94

[1] Estimated.
[2] Requested.

It will be noted that we will start the coming fiscal year (fiscal year 1961) with a carryover of $204 million of valid but unfinanced authorized projects. To this is added the $158 million of new projects presented to the Armed Services Committees and $8 million of deficiency projects. If approved this will result in a total of $370 million in authorized projects for fiscal year 1961. Repealed projects are shown below the baseline; and for the coming year are presently estimated at $127 million.

Taking off from this point, where above our baseline we have $370 million total authorization, we see next the estimated obligation of $212 million in fiscal year 1961. This includes utilization of the carryover of $97 million from fiscal year 1960 which I previously discussed. This carryover is a reduction from that of fiscal year 1959 ($105 million) and is largely dictated by the size of the program and existing management procedures. To the $97 million carryover is added the requested appropriation of $209 million. The difference, or $94 million represents the unobligated balance estimated to be carried over at the end of fiscal year 1961.

The white bar represents the estimated expenditure level for fiscal year 1961 of $252 million, an amount approximately equal to the $255 million which we now estimate for fiscal year 1960. The chart clearly shows a steadily declining trend in the Army MCA program, and particularly a rapid decline in unfinanced authorizations. A great deal of emphasis has been placed upon reduction of this carryover authorization. While there is satisfaction over the low level achieved, we have some concern that we may lose adequate flexibility for program adjustment and efficient application of funds in case of unforeseen delays.

Now, with the committee's permission I would like to describe briefly the major construction categories which are included within the funding plan.

The first category, "Operational and training facilities," includes various types of buildings and facilities required either in military operations or training of individuals and units. Among the projects of this type in the program before the committee are an academic facility for the Army's Ordnance School at Aberdeen, Md., communications facilities at 14 installations, including 5 overseas, training and aircraft operational facilities at several of the Army's school posts, and trainfire ranges for small arms at six installations. The total

amount requested in this category is $56.4 million which includes $10.4 million for the Alternate Joint Communications Center.

The second category, "Maintenance and production facilities," includes buildings and facilities for maintenance of all types of equipment and weapons used by the Army including, among others, aircraft, missiles, tanks, guns, motor vehicles, and electronic devices. Among the projects in this category are modification of a building for the aircraft maintenance activity at Atlanta General Depot, Ga., an aircraft paint shop at Sharpe General Depot, Calif., aircraft maintenance hangars at Fort Meade, Md., Fort Rucker, Ala., and Fort Ord, Calif., and motor repair and missile maintenance shops at various installations in the United States and overseas. The total requested for such projects is $9.2 million.

Next is the category of "Research and development and test facilities," required for such programs of the Army. This category, aggregating $35.7 million, is for construction all within the continental United States except for classified construction in overseas areas in connection with NIKE–ZEUS development work. It includes projects at the Research and Engineering Center for vital work of the Quartermaster Corps, a bio-math science building for the Chemical Corps at Fort Detrick, Md., environmental test facilities for the Signal Corps at the Electronic Proving Ground at Fort Huachuca, Ariz., a Medical Research Institute at Fort Knox, Ky., the final increment to complete the Research and Development Laboratory at Fort Monmouth, N.J., and a Medical Research Nuclear Laboratory for the Defense Atomic Support Agency at the Naval Medical Center, Md.

Another of the facility categories included in this program is that for "Supply facilities." These may be defined as general supply and special storage facilities, ammunition storage, and fuel storage. Projects of this nature proposed in this program include a storage and service building at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, battalion storerooms at Fort Bragg, N.C., ammunition igloos at two installations in the United States and two oversea stations, plus additional facilities for storage of petroleum products and vital combat materiel stocks in the European area and Far East. The total amount requested for such facilities is $12.6 million.

The next category is "Hospital and medical facilities." This category totals $4.4 million, all of which is for construction within the United States except for one project to air condition the Army hospital at Okinawa and a very small dispensary at an oversea location. Included in the request is one hospital, a 75-bed facility at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md. Additionally, this category contains a pharmacy for Madigan General Hospital, in the State of Washington, a medical laboratory at Fort Meade, Md., a dispensary and dental clinic at Fort Benning, Ga., and modification of the base hospital at Sandia Base, N. Mex.

With regard to the hospital included in the program and congressional interest in hospital costs during the last session of Congress, I would like to state that the cost of this project reflects the recent revisions in hospital criteria which have been agreed on with the Department of Defene. As a result of these revised criteria there has been an appreciable reduction in the estimated cost of the proposed facility.

The next category is "Administrative facilities." Projects of this nature in our program this year, total only $4.8 million, all of which, with two exceptions, is for administrative facilities for units of regimental size or smaller. Representative projects are two battalion readquarters buildings at the Transportation Corps Center, Fort Eustis, Va., regimental headquarters at the Infantry School, Fort Benning, Ga., headquarters for two of our strategic communications stations overseas and regimental headquarters at Fort Bliss, Tex. The exceptions to which I referred are a project for additional conversion of the warehouse building in St. Louis, the Mart Building, which houses many administrative functions of Army commands and Technical Service elements in that area and the Training Command headquarters building at the Army's Transportation School, Fort Eustis, Va.

The next major category is "Housing and community facilities." This includes all housing—family quarters, bachelor officers' quarters, nurses' quarters, and barracks—and all types of community facilities for morale, welfare, and recreation. This category totals $34.8 million. Included are 4,036 permanent barracks spaces within our continental base plant and Okinawa and 1,492 semipermanent spaces in temporary base-rights areas overseas. In addition, there are 756 permanent bachelor officers' spaces in the continental United States and

36 semipermanent spaces at an oversea station, plus 53 units of appropriated fund family quarters, to be built at a station where Capehart housing is not feasible.

The eighth category covers all "Utilities and grounds improvements." These comprise such projects as extensions or improvements of electrical systems, heating systems, and water supply systems, storm drainage, roads, and rail connections. This category totals $20.6 million.

The final category is "Real estate," which includes the acquisition of real property and real property site improvements. This year again our land acquisition in the program contains the very minimum. The total amount requested is $122,000 which provides for acquisition of some 625 acres of land for two off base flight training operation areas required at Fort Rucker, Ala., by the Army Aviation School and flight clearance easements over 145 acres at Fort Belvoir to lessen hazard adjacent to Davison Army Air Field at that station.

This concludes my statement on the proposed "Military construction, Army," appropriation which we are presenting today. The detailed project justifications to support the facilities for which we are requesting appropriation are contained in three books, including one which is solely for classified projects. Sufficient copies have been furnished to the committee counsel for each of the committee members.

With the permission of the committee, I propose to begin the review of the program with facilities for the Ordnance Corps followed by those for the other technical services, then the armies, other commands in the United States, and conclude with the oversea theaters. From time to time it may be necessary to introduce supporting witnesses as experts in particular fields; however, in the main I will attempt to provide answers for such questions as may arise.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions, gentlemen?

Mr. JONAS. I would like to ask the general a question:

INCREASE FOR RENTS AND UTILITY SERVICES

On page 2 of the green sheets you show $6.7 million proposed spending for rents and utility services. That is $6.4 million above 1960. Is that for computer equipment or why is that sizable increase in rents and utility services?

General SEEMAN. Sir, I cannot answer that question offhand.

Mr. JONAS. My guess is that it is rental on a lot of computing equipment.

General SEEMAN. No, sir. In the construction area I do not know of any computer projects, sir.

Mr. JONAS. Well, I cannot understand why you had $205,275 in 1959, $210,000 in 1960 and you jump up to $6.7 million in 1961.

General SEEMAN. This looks like it includes the Okinawa land payments.

Mr. WESTENBERGER. There is $6.5 million in here for Okinawa land payments.

General SEEMAN. Back several years ago the Army was given an authorization to accommodate the land payments in Okinawa.

Mr. JONAS. As rental of land?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir. There has been a combination of long-term leasing and short-term leasing. The long-term (over 5 years) prepared leases are financed from military construction, Army and the short-term leases from operation and maintenance funds.

Mr. JONAS. At the rate of $6.5 million a year?

General SEEMAN. There is $6.5 million in our fiscal 1961 funding program for the long-term prepaid leases, again for the Army's share. There was none in new obligational authority requested in 1960 and 1959 because we had carryover authority and adequate funding for it.

Mr. JONAS. That is all.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Gentlemen, I thank you very much for your appearance and your explanations.

We shall stand adjourned until 10 o'clock on Wednesday morning.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 23, 1960.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Gentlemen, we shall continue our hearings on the military budget request for construction this morning.

ORDNANCE

Mr. Reporter, you will insert in the record page 2 having to do with Ordnance.

(The page referred to follows:)

Installation summary

[In thousands]

	Prior authorization	Proposed authorization	Proposed funding
Ordnance	$2,670	$11,431	$14,101
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md	2,670	5,121	7,791
Benecia Arsenal, Calif	0	337	337
Blue Grass Ordnance Depot, Ky	0	353	353
Picatinny Arsenal, N.J	0	850	850
Pueblo Ordnance Depot, Colo	0	369	369
Redstone Arsenal, Ala	0	1,000	1,000
Umatilla Ordnance Depot, Oreg	0	319	319
Watertown Arsenal, Mass	0	1,849	1,849
White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex	0	1,233	1,233

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM | FISCAL YEAR: 1961 | DEPARTMENT: ARMY | DATE: 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Aberdeen Proving Ground	Maryland	Permanent	MD-1A
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Aberdeen	Harford	Ordnance	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Research & Development		1918	Active

II - MISSION

Aberdeen Proving Ground is the principal Ordnance Corps installation for ballistics research, applied research in systems and areas related to Ordnance development, engineering and proof testing of Ordnance material, and Ordnance training activities. It maintains appropriate scientific, technical and training staffs and facilities for the purpose of performing functions in these fields, and serves as headquarters for The Ordnance Training Command, The Ordnance School, and The Ordnance Board. In addition, it is responsible for the execution of special missions relating to human engineering studies, explosive Ordnance disposal activities, coating and chemical research, production of Ordnance technical intelligence. (*One time cost for easement)

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 59	659	4,111	4,696		9,426
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	1,871	6,573	6,330		14,974

IV - INVENTORY

	LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED		72,637	$ 4,226,060	$ 39,983,507	$ 44,209,567
2. LEASED		88	($ 13,800*)		$ 19,800
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959 (Except Land Rent)					$ 44,229,367
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY					$ 8,422,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST					$ 5,121,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION					$ 67,976,000
7. GRAND TOTAL					$ 125,748,367

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY					PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)				
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30June59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30June59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m	
171	193	Academic Building TOS	5	SF	0	155,000	0	155,000	3,321	0	3,321	3,321	108
510	44	Station Hospital (75/75-Bed)	8	Bed	0	100	0	75	1,983	0	1,685	1,685	76
821	199	Hospital Heating Plant	9	BTU	0	8 Mil	0	8 Mil	115	0	115	115	77
										SUB-TOTAL	5,121	5,121	
		Prior Authorization PL 86/149											
724	146	Bachelor Officer Quarters	10	Men	27	535	120	0	5,100	1,096	0	576	107

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (Continued)

INSTALLATION NAME: Aberdeen Proving Ground

DATE: 2 Mar 1960

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)				
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m	
		Prior Authorization											
		PL 85/685											
722	188	2 EM Barracks, w/o Mess (326-Man)	11	Men	589	4,977	1,630	0	9,960	3,223	0	1,287	175
723	189	Battalion Administration & Supply Bldg	12	SF	0	79,500	26,000	0	1,690	543	0	282	176
723	190	Battalion Mess Building	13	SF	0	81,060	26,560	0	2,200	712	0	385	177
821	57	Heating Plant	14	BTU	0	50 Mil	10 Mil	0	700	140	0	140	178
										SUB-TOTAL	0	2,094	
										TOTAL	5,121	7,791	

4

DA FORM 1674a-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE

LOCATION OF TRAINING AT ABERDEEN

Mr. SHEPPARD. Turning our attention to Aberdeen Proving Grounds, what consideration has been given to locating all or a portion of this training as contemplated in the new buildings at another location where space is available at less cost?

General SEEMAN. Aberdeen is the location of the Ordnance Training Command. When the new missile weapons came along and started their development at White Sands and Redstone a certain amount of the training had to be done at that point. However, this has been strictly limited to a few of the new weapons and the permanent location for Ordnance Corps Branch training is at Aberdeen.

This training is now carried on there in temporary mobilization-type buildings. It is the cheapest and the best place for centralizing this training and that is the purpose of this new building, Mr. Chairman, to put them in more modern and more economical facilities.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is your response to the possibility of locating all or a portion of this at any other location?

General SEEMAN. The Ordnance Corps has no other location which is as centralized as this, with the overhead and academic staff.

The other locations are either manufacturing or research and development posts or depots, which are not suited for academic purposes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is my understanding that we have a school at Redstone, Ala.

General SEEMAN. I mentioned that. When the missile first came in we had to take some of the initial instruction in the missiles down there due to the shortage of scientific instructors and the early equipment. They weren't manufactured in large amounts. There is an Ordnance Guided Missile School there, but the large part of the training on all of the conventional arms and equipment of the Ordnance, automotive and other branch requirements, enlisted specialists and officer basic course is at Aberdeen now, which is the greatest part of their overhead and academic structure.

Mr. VAN KUREN. May I add, putting this type of training at Redstone would require the same additional construction because the training facilities at Redstone are fully utilized for technical training and guided missiles.

Mr. JONAS. Would you yield, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Would there not be some advantage in having this academic activity near the concentration of civilian space efforts, near Dr. von Braun and his folks?

Mr. VAN KUREN. There is no direct training relationship.

Mr. JONAS. That is what worries me. Why is there not more cooperation? Could you not take advantage of some of their knowledge in your academic training of your people?

Mr. VAN KUREN. Sir, there is cooperation and coordination in doctrine, in technical data and all of the materiel available. These are fully coordinated activities, but the statement I am making is that in training our military specialists in their technical trades, we do not get any technical material directly from the space activity. It is working in a different field than our military service people.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, to boil it all down, the concept is: You feel you would not have anything to gain economically or academically by consolidation of this activity in the already existing

place at Alabama, for example, even though you had to add an additional appurtenance to the buildings?

Mr. VAN KUREN. It not only would not give us an advantage, it would be a disadvantage because of the other training facilities and material that is at Aberdeen and has been since World War II.

CURRENT SPACE AVAILABLE FOR TRAINING

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much space is occupied by this facility now and how is it divided between permanent, semipermanent and temporary space?

Mr. VAN KUREN. The present training is being carried on in 14 temporary buildings. All of it is World War II mobilization facilities—barracks, former warehouses, and frame classroom buildings. In addition, we are using temporarily, a small amount of space in two permanent buildings, which must be released for other use.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, while you have those facilities there to the degree that you have just expressed, you do not have sufficient room to use them. In other words, they are not compatible with the requirements from a workload point of view, irrespective of the condition of the buildings at the moment?

Mr. VAN KUREN. They are small. The total space is not adequate for use, and they are so scattered that it interferes with the continuity and coordination of training.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What will be done with the facilities if you get the new facility?

Mr. VAN KUREN. The temporary buildings in which this training is now conducted are scheduled to be demolished.

General SEEMAN. On page 6 of form 1475 there is a statement that "Directly affected and scheduled to be demolished when proposed facility is erected are 14 temporary, frame, World War II buildings consisting of 123,109 square feet."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Our report indicates that your permanent facilities are a total of 24,600 square feet.

General SEEMAN. That is correct, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you going to do with them?

General SEEMAN. This would be utilized in a supply and maintenance training department for the new Ordnance special weapons and missile calibration specialist course.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where is the training being effected at the present time?

General SEEMAN. The information we have, Mr. Chairman, is this is a new course just started; is that right, Mr. Van Kuren?

Mr. VAN KUREN. That is right.

The portion of our officer training that is being done in existing permanent buildings now is in our fire-control building which is available to this course on a temporary loan basis, but it is scheduled and required for the special weapons calibration course.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the present student population and how many of these are foreign officers?

General SEEMAN. The average student load is 425 residents and the program is to increase this to 545 by 1965. I do not have figures, Mr. Chairman, on the number of foreign students that are involved here.

Mr. VAN KUREN. I might add, General Seeman, that none of the foreign officers are included in the student load figures which we have given in this project. These figures do not include foreign officers.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, the answer is: There is none of them?

General SEEMAN. That is right. These figures are officers only, Mr. Chairman. It does not include the enlisted specialists that may be there.

CAFETERIA, REFERENCE, AND STUDY CENTER AREA

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the requirement for the large cafeteria, reference, and study center area?

What is your justification for that?

Mr. VAN KUREN. The only cafeteria facilities which we now have at Aberdeen are in a remote part of the post, and they are too small, so in order to meet the total eating requirement, and to place it close to the student requirement, we felt it should be included in this building.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You mean that your workload requirement there exceeds that of your present capabilities; is that it?

Mr. VAN KUREN. In the cafeteria area; yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are going to use both of them, even though you go to the new one?

Mr. VAN KUREN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you contemplate air conditioning and humidity control? If so, what is the situation pertaining to that?

General SEEMAN. This building is planned to be air conditioned, sir. It is within the zones of permissible air conditioning, and for modern efficiency in instruction and academic work the air conditioning is a requirement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. As a component part of your financial request having to do with this operation, do you contemplate making provisions for TV items and things of that general character?

Mr. VAN KUREN. In our training plan we do plan to use modern equipment, such as closed-circuit TV. That is part of the plans. We are now making excellent use of this at Redstone and between Redstone and Fort Knox, for instance. It saves us a great deal of money in our training program in that it is not necessary to transport people and material to do training at another point.

REDUCTION IN SQUARE-FOOT HOSPITAL COST

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice that there is a slight square-foot cost reduction in the hospital at Aberdeen compared to those in last year's program.

To what extent does this hospital represent a difference in design and cost as compared to those within the 1961 request?

General SEEMAN. I would like to have Colonel Hastings come up to the table also, sir. This hospital at Aberdeen is direct development out of review of hospital plans and criteria during and following the congressional hearings of last year. The scope and square feet and cost is monitored by the Department of Defense and represents their decision, based upon the similar factors in all of the services, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, can you tell me at the moment whether there has been any deletion from your original specs and requirements here, reduced down or diminished, as it were, in order to meet that criteria of expenditure or just what is the story? What has been done here? Was the original price factor in error or what is the story about this?

General SEEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am very mindful of one of your questions day before yesterday when you asked whether all of the projects were completely funded in this program.

Here, in all honesty, I must say there is a possibility where there could be different interpretations. Our study of the Aberdeen requirements, based upon actual figures of outpatient load and bed-patient load was for a hospital of 100 beds here at Aberdeen.

In reviewing this project before the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget, it was determined that 75 beds would be the maximum, largely, I might say, based upon a desire that 25 beds be allocated and considered for use at hospitals in the vicinity which had been constructed under the Hill-Burton Act or other similar acts.

Even within the category of a 100- or a 75-bed hospital, I might suggest these figures: For a 100-bed hospital, the Surgeon General's determination of what he actually requires is 77,905 square feet. According to the current DOD criteria the maximum amount would be 60,000 square feet. This is an honest or otherwise difference of opinion of approximately 30 percent. Now, dropping down to the 75-bed hospital, the Surgeon General's analysis of the requirements is 75,095 square feet, whereas the strict application of the criteria limits it to 49,350 square feet.

This presents the possibilities, Mr. Chairman, that varying amounts of the old hospital or other facilities now in use to meet their load will have to be continued in service, or at some later date when this temporary construction becomes completely impossible to maintain, that we might have to come back for and request a permanent building and could lead to an interpretation, sir, that we have incompletely funded a particular item.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that policy pursued upon the basis of sound economy or is it just something to meet a budget requirement?

General SEEMAN. You have these other factors such as peak loads during the winter season and the surgeon general does have plans for putting in additional beds to take those peak loads.

On the other hand, there are experience factors where even that expansibility is insufficient. How much you build up to take peak loads and such questions are a matter of judgment.

There is no question about it, the Army's feeling is that you would do better to build as much under the one roof and take advantage of economical overhead as possible and get away from the possibility of a split operation, either across the street or depending upon the master plan, a half mile away, with an old hospital plant.

In all justice, also, sir, there have been cost reductions effected in the plan designs, placing enameled equipment in lieu of stainless steel wherever possible, using commercial type hospital elevators instead of stainless steel elevators, reduction, for example in small things like the number of oxygen outlets where central oxygen supply is utilized. These have all been gone through with the Department of Defense—revisions in the doctors' paging system and central dictating

systems and intercoms, and elimination of a pneumatic tube system in hospitals, the smaller ones of less than 250 beds. These are examples of some of the things that we have reduced.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then there will be a reasonable portion of your workload requirement that will be maintained in the existing hospital facilities. That is true?

General SEEMAN. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How will maintenance costs in the new hospital compare with those being incurred in the present hospital?

General SEEMAN. The maintenance cost of a new building, on a square foot basis, will be less than on the mobilization type building. On the other hand, maintenance of the temporary buildings is sometimes accomplished by putting it off for as long as you can and then doing it as a major rehabilitation so you cannot really figure it on an annual basis, except by generalizing, Mr. Chairman, that the temporary building upkeep takes 10 to 15 cents a square foot, where permanent type building will take 5 to 10 cents a square foot.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How close can you give us an absolute figure of the differential between the two at this particular installation?

Colonel Hastings, do you have a figure?

Colonel HASTINGS. No, sir. We have no information on that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I will tell you what motivates that question so far as I am concerned, as to the manner in which your money is handled. I don't like your accounts the way they are presently being presented. I do not mean you. I know you are following your procedural function in your breakdown of your budget. Consequently, I find by observation in the field generally that much of our properties that could be kept and should be kept in pretty good condition are deteriorating because of the fact that under this type budget function it is very easy to take over maintenance money for operational purposes. I mean as a preferential concept. That is what is being done. Looking that picture over, it would occur to me that it might be well for the benefit of the military itself if those things were just separated one from the other and let each one stand on its own feet.

I wish you would insert in the record a tabulation showing the hospital population and the average annual school training load for the past 5 years.

General SEEMAN. We will be very happy to do that.

(The information requested follows:)

Fiscal year 1961 MCA program Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.

	Average daily in hospital load	Outpatient loads		Average student loads		
		Total	Daily average	Officers	Enlisted men	Total
January-June 1955	80	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
July-December 1955	61	(1)	(1)	499	2,023	2,522
January-June 1956	63	(1)	(1)	463	2,164	2,627
July-December 1956	53	(1)	(1)	562	1,974	2,536
January-June 1957	58	49,644	275	694	1,943	2,637
July-December 1957	60	53,356	296	511	2,533	3,044
January-June 1958	62	44,739	249	462	1,559	2,021
July-December 1958	49	46,128	256	340	1,055	1,395
January-June 1959	62	45,786	254	407	1,444	1,851
July-December 1959	47	42,702	237	412	1,425	1,837

[1] Not available.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where are the enlisted men housed who will go into these new barracks buildings?

General SEEMAN. The troops that will go into these new barracks buildings at present are generally housed in World War II mobilization type barracks. The question here, too, is the fact that the buildings are over 18 or more years old and they are becoming not only expensive to maintain, but they are just inadequate for the present time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, I would assume from your answer that there has been a study made and consideration given to rehabilitating these barracks and the cost factors involved before you came up with your request.

Is that a reasonable assumption, or otherwise?

General SEEMAN. That is correct, sir. The people that will be housed in this new barracks will be the people who are presently being housed in the World War II type barracks which have not been rehabilitated under the program as you will recall for fiscal years 1955 and 1956. We will use then the permanent barracks available and the improved and modified barracks and demolish the World War II unimproved barracks.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But a study has been made insofar as the rehabilitation is concerned, I presume; is that correct?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir. After we completed that plan back in 1955 and 1956, it was determined that the Army would not undertake to rehabilitate the old World War II barracks.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for the mess building in the barracks area at the present time?

General SEEMAN. The messes presently being used are in the same area as the World War II barracks. That is, in temporary mess buildings. These two new barracks are without messes because there is a separate mess in this complex. Is that correct, Mr. Van Kuren?

Mr. VAN KUREN. There is a battalion mess in this program, as part of this barracks complex.

General SEEMAN. This is the two barracks, a mess building and an administration and supply building and a heating plant, to make up this complex.

Mr. VAN KUREN. Most troops are now being fed in temporary frame construction of World War II, which was built with the temporary barracks in which they are now living.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why can't existing structures in the area be used for the administration buildings?

General SEEMAN. If they are in the area, Mr. Chairman, they would be the old mobilization type buildings similar to the old barracks. It has been our plan to have the barracks, the company administration and headquarters buildings along with the supply buildings as a complete complex. If we do not build the administration and supply buildings the practice has been, since the unit must be adequately maintained and operated, to divert some of the permanent barracks building to be used for office and administration space. This, of course, is a misuse of a building since it was designed for the housing of the enlisted men.

STATUS OF A. & E. WORK

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has all of your A. & E. work on these new proposed buildings been completed and finalized or not?

Mr. NORWOOD. If I may answer, the academic building, the hospital, and the hospital heating plant are in the preliminary planning stage. They are very preliminary. However, the remaining items in the program are either 100 percent complete in final design or a hundred percent complete in preliminary design on which good estimates of costs were made.

General SEEMAN. The barracks complex, Mr. Chairman, are standard plans, which will be utilized.

Mr. SHEPPARD. To the degree that you have had any work done on a specific building, to which it has been done, who was the firm that did the job and what was the cost factor for the firm to do the job?

Do you have that information with you?

Mr. NORWOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right. I want it.

Mr. NORWOOD. The bachelor officers quarters is a hundred percent complete, final design was performed by the firm of MacLane & Chewning, Washington, D.C.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What was the cost factor paid for the job that you have just referred to?

Mr. NORWOOD. I will have to supply that. I do not have the design cost.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you will, please.

(The information requested follows:)

Design cost was $23,000.

Mr. NORWOOD. The enlisted men's barracks, preliminary plans are 100 percent complete. The architect-engineer firm is Lublin McGoughy of Washington, D.C. The other three items were also by the same architect-engineer and are the same degree of completion, namely; 100 percent complete preliminary plans. Design cost for enlisted men's barracks is $50,000; for battalion administration and supply building, $100,000; for battalion mess building $13,000; and for the heating plant, $6,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I presume there is a time limit that has been set on each one of these architect and engineer jobs for finalization; is that correct?

Mr. NORWOOD. There is. It is not a hard and fast contract completion date with penalties, but we have given them a completion date.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it the intention of you people who are directing this expenditure in these fields to have your plans finalized before you go to competitive bid, or are you going to an assumptive bid or preliminary bid aspect at the time of issuance of the contracts?

General SEEMAN. No, sir, none of this. No job would be entered into of this category without complete plans and specifications to permit a reasoned and proper bid.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are you going into competitive bid in this situation at the time you issue your contracts for the construction purpose or in a semicompetitive bid and negotiation factor, which one?

Before you answer that, I want to say this to you, gentlemen: This question is being asked for a very definite purpose and we

expect this to be the answer that will be pursued and not a change or switch in the procedure after you have given your testimony here as to the procedure.

General SEEMAN. I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman. There is no intention whatsoever of building at this time, to enter into any construction contract without open competitive bids based upon complete plans and specifications, and the award of the contract to the low bidder providing he is responsible in all respects.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right. The gentleman on my left, do you wish to inquire into that particular item having to do with Aberdeen?

Mr. JONAS. Yes. I have just two questions.

MODERNIZATION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS VERSUS NEW BUILDINGS

General, what consideration did you give to modernizing these existing barracks and bachelor officers quarters? I notice you have already modernized 1,200 units and why couldn't you follow that same plan and modernize the existing barracks instead of building new ones? I have personally inspected some modernized barracks at other locations and found them very satisfactory, entirely acceptable for all purposes and represent a considerable saving of money.

General SEEMAN. Mr. Chairman, the Congress approved the modernization program for barracks back in 1955 when the requirement to place the services, and it applies to the other services as well as the Army, in a long range, more economical type of construction following the war was first considered. The problem of trying to build all of that program at one time was impossible to accommodate.

This is why the modernization program was initiated at that time. Those World War II barracks are what we call 63-man barracks. To modernize them a latrine was added in the second floor and certain other improvements, to get 10 years more life. This was the discussion which occurred in the Congress at that time and that is why we do not construct any replacements for those modernized barracks until that 10-year life, at least, has been realized.

The cost of modernizing those buildings was in the realm of $20,000 a building, depending upon the post and the location, for 60 to 63 men. This is considerable cost. Furthermore, we have had now 5 to 6 years more life of those old frame structures, and with the foundations and the rotting and the other things—their complete plumbing and heating facilities are in such state that it is just not a good business proposition to modernize any more of them. This has been the feeling of the Army people.

Mr. JONAS. You did consider that then and rejected it?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir. This has been considered.

Mr. JONAS. And you are satisfied that it would be more economical to build new structures?

General SEEMAN. Yes, within the limits of an annual increment, as we can handle it, and with the approval of the Congress.

SQUARE-FOOT COST OF HOSPITAL

Mr. JONAS. I am a little bit concerned over this hospital. I recognize that you have your square foot cost down slightly from last year but when you relate this cost to beds, I see you have about $22,000 a bed

in here for a 75-bed hospital and more than that, the thing that concerns me is that you have 658 square feet per bed. How do you justify that?

General SEEMAN. Colonel Hastings?

Colonel HASTINGS. We have cut the costs, sir, by taking out the 100-percent expansion factor of the chassis that was in there last year. The 658 square feet per bed is partially explained by the fact that we still build into our hospitals approximately a 20-percent expansion factor for the seasonal fluctuation of hospital patients that we have. Now, if we have a run on colds at one of our posts with a new hospital of the type proposed for Aberdeen, we could put in approximately 15 to 20 percent more patients in the hospital than its rated capacity and not overcrowd it seriously. Our bed areas are designed on the wards at 100 square feet per bed. That is the area devoted to the bed only. Now, in the expansion that is reduced to 72 square feet per bed, thereby allowing the seasonal fluctuation in medical care to be given. That accounts primarily for the 658 square feet per bed.

Mr. JONAS. You must have quite a bit of operating room space, receiving room space, and other space in this hospital that is not used for beds.

Colonel HASTINGS. That is correct.

Mr. JONAS. Even with the figures you have given, that is quite a spread between that and 658 square feet.

Colonel HASTINGS. That is correct, sir. There are two operating rooms in the plan for the Aberdeen Hospital, but we also provide doctors' offices.

Mr. JONAS. For outpatients?

Colonel HASTINGS. To a certain extent. They will be very limited in the new hospital at Aberdeen, but the physicians who are assigned to work the hospital as such must have an office to work in. This includes the doctor's office and an examining room for examination of his patients. There are many facilities right through the hospital like that. The pharmacy will be slightly larger than would be found in a normal hospital because it will be designed to take care of both inpatients and outpatients.

Mr. JONAS. You say the difference between 72 square feet per bed and the 658 square feet is accounted for by these extra rooms that you described?

General SEEMAN. Laboratories, doctors' office, clinics, pharmacy, other requirements that are there.

Mr. JONAS. That is all.

General SEEMAN. I might add that our information is that the Bureau of the Budget has recently developed national average square foot prices for hospital construction, which in effect are limitations.

These prices we are told are derived from bid experience on 60 civilian hospitals constructed under the Hill-Burton Act and are as follows: For a 50-bed hospital, $31 a square foot; for a 75- to 100-bed hospital, $30 a square foot; for a 200- to 300-bed hospital, $28 a square foot.

Mr. JONAS. I am not making any point about the square foot cost. I am directing my inquiry to the cost per bed. With 49,000 square

feet available, I should think you ought to have 150 beds or 125 at least instead of 75. That was why I was making inquiry.

General SEEMAN. As far as pure bed spaces the Surgeon General's feeling was that a hundred beds were necessary. The big problem in modern medicine is the fact that so relatively few people are bed patients. The actual experience at Aberdeen, for example, in outpatients, during 1959, was 7,375 outpatients per month. This is where you have the tremendous volume. They are treated by examinations, by taking certain blood and other tests in the laboratories. There were a total of 18,858 per month of such tests during 1959, of which 14,498 were for outpatients and only 4,360 for inpatients.

Mr. JONAS. Will your outpatient clinic be in this hospital?

General SEEMAN. I am not sure we have an outpatient clinic in the present scope.

Colonel HASTINGS. No, sir. It will have to be primarily retained in the old buildings. There is some room within the square footage that we would get in the new hospital in which outpatients could be taken care of, but rather than split the facility between two buildings or two groups of buildings, we will continue to give the outpatient care in the——

Mr. JONAS. Do you mean to retain all of the 22 buildings that now constitute the hospital?

Colonel HASTINGS. No, sir; only those buildings that would be required for outpatient treatment. That would be approximately four buildings.

Mr. JONAS. The others would be demolished?

Colonel HASTINGS. Yes, sir.

General SEEMAN. I am not sure about the demolition.

Mr. JONAS. You say they are too close to the range?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir; they would be too close to the range for continuing at this stage.

Colonel Hastings' answer was that those four buildings would be retained active. The remainder of the hospital might be retained for mobilization purposes, but the present plan is to tear it down. I stand corrected.

Mr. VAN KUREN. Actually, there is other permanent construction in the long-range plan for that area.

Mr. JONAS. You are going to give up 280 beds, then?

Mr. VAN KUREN. Having seen the hospital personally and the conditions under which they are operating, I think it is suitable only for demolition, sir.

Mr. JONAS. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

BENICIA ARSENAL, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, gentlemen, we will pick up the next item reflected on page 15 of the justification, Benicia Arsenal.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

FISCAL YEAR	DEPARTMENT	DATE
1961	ARMY	1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Benicia Arsenal	California	Permanent	Cal-29
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental) COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Benicia	Solano	Ordnance	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Depot		1862	Active

II - MISSION

Receives, stores and issues general supplies, including wheeled vehicles to designated CONUS areas and overseas. Perform stock control accountability for Benicia Arsenal and Sierra Ordnance Depot. Perform depot maintenance on: artillery; combat and transport vehicles; fire control and armament, guided missile materiel including; ground control, launching and handling equipment, and associated general supply equipment components, propulsion and internal guidance systems, and all inert ammunition components of missiles; small arms, tires, tubes and related components, vehicular armament and trailer mounts. Performs functional tests of artillery materiel. Inspects and repairs small arms gages.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 59	17	6	2682	0	2705
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	16	0	3163	0	3179

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	2,197	$ 226,848	$ 32,236,505	$ 32,463,353
2. LEASED	110	($ 551/yr)	86,765	$ 86,765
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959			(Except Land Rent)	$ 32,550,118
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 337,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 18,811,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 51,698,118

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO.	LINE ITEM NO.	DESCRIPTION	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO.	UNIT OF MEASURE	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 19 59 30 f Jun	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 19 59 30 h Jun	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 19 59 30 k Jun	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
a	b	c	d	e		g		i	j		l	m
832	20	Sewage Disposal Facilities	[illegible]	LF	45,245	12,320	0	12,320	337	0	337	337

15

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE

Preliminary design is 20 percent complete by district engineer, San Francisco; design cost, $17,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What local cooperation is required for implementation of the sewage disposal in this area and what steps have they taken to fulfill their part of the agreements?

General SEEMAN. The sewage disposal system at Benicia Arsenal is essentially the tieline to a sewage disposal plant which has been constructed by the city of Benicia. Some years ago an architect-engineer studied the plan for that area and it was concluded in cooperation with the local civilian community that the Army would participate by tying into their plant and this is what is planned at the present time, sir. In all frankness, this item was not originally in our authorization program. It was inserted by the House Armed Services Committee, which had a presentation from the local people and we have included it in our funding plan at this time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I assume it was concurred in by the Bureau of the Budget or it would not be here, is that correct?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir. We have gotten additional approval from the DOD and the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on this item?

Mr. WHITTEN. No questions.

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

BLUE GRASS ORDNANCE DEPOT, KY.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall pick up the next item having to do with the Blue Grass Ordnance Depot reflected on page 18.

Preliminary design is 20 percent complete by district engineer, San Francisco; design cost, $17,000.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Blue Grass Ordnance Depot	Kentucky	Permanent	Ky-1
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Richmond, 6 miles NW	Madison	Ordnance	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Ammuniti[illegible]n Storage and Distribution		1942	Active

II - MISSION

Receives, stores and distributes general supplies and ammunition. Stores strategic and critical General Services Administration materials as directed by the Chief of Ordnance. Performs depot maintenance, modification, renovation, demilitarization and surveillance on ammunition.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	8	0	682		690
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	10	0	1161		1,171

IV - INVENTORY

	LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1.	OWNED	14,599	$ 1,665,377	$ 25,027,378	$ 26,692,755
2.	LEASED	0	($)		$ 0
3.	INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959			(Except Land Rent)	$ 26,692,755
4.	AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 0
5.	AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 353,000
6.	ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 38,504,000
7.	GRAND TOTAL				$ 65,549,755

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PROJ NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30June59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
872	30	Physical Security Facilities	19	LF	192,094	16,800	0	16,800	353	0	353	353

168

18

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Preliminary design is 95 percent complete, by district engineer, Louisville; design cost, $18,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has a determination been made that Blue Grass is a permanent ordnance depot and no likelihood of it being closed?

General SEEMAN. For the foreseeable future, this is one of our Ordnance depots that is in the long-range plan. It has been so selected for this special ammunition requirement, which requires this additional security facility construction.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And insofar as you know, or have been advised, is not under study for discontinuance by DOD or any other branch of the Government at the moment?

General SEEMAN. It is in the complex which has been under study but this particular one is not in the area which we foresee will be inactivated or disposed of.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Gentlemen, under the circumstances, I have been advised that DOD still is making a very concerted effort as to what they will eliminate. With their approval, which is indicated or you would not be here with it, the committee will take that into consideration in allocating funds, and assume that based upon the fact that the presentation has come before the committee DOD intends to keep this in an operational category in order to obviate undue or unnecessary expense.

Mr. JONAS. The only security facilities you have used in the past have been guard posts?

General SEEMAN. With the conventional ammunition and the separation between the igloos a roving guard has been sufficient. With the higher quality of this special storage and the requirements for security, and the fact they will save three guard posts at an estimated value of $150,000, that has been taken into consideration.

Mr. JONAS. I must comment that this is not a true saving unless you get rid of all the personnel.

General SEEMAN. That is right. These are largely civilians and not a place where military people are used extensively.

PICATINNY ARSENAL, N.J.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall pick up the next item reflected on page 21.

Preliminary design is 95 percent complete, by district engineer, Louisville; design cost, $18,000.
DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

FISCAL YEAR: 1961 | DEPARTMENT: ARMY | DATE: 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Picatinny Arsenal	New Jersey	Permanent	NJ-701
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Dover, 3 miles S.	Morris	Ordnance	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Research and Development and Industrial Support Mission		1879	Active

II - MISSION

A field installation of the Ordnance Corps engaged in Research and Development and charged with the National Development Mission responsibility of such items as complete rounds of artillery, mortar and atomic ammunition, mines, grenades, bombs, demolition charges and non-explosive equipment and pyrotechnics special weapons material, drill ammunition, jatos, warheads, rockets and explosives. Support mission responsibilities include development, industrial engineering, manufacture and maintenance engineering on many of the items mentioned above.

*One time cost for easement.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	42	46	5866		5954
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	36	61	6245		6342

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	5,098	$ 686,098	$ 40,357,233	$ 41,043,331
2. LEASED	643	($ 83,231*)		$ 83,231
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959			(Except Land Rent)	$ 41,126,562
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 850,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 36,009,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 77,985,562

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 30 June 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 30 June 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m	
310	11	Addition to Explosives and Propellant Research Laboratories	22	SF	10,890	8,650	0	8,650	250	0	250	250	201
310	36	Plastics Research Laboratory Addition	24	SF	3,800	11,896	0	11,896	600	0	600	600	200
										TOTAL	850	850	

21

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Preliminary design for both these items is 100 percent complete, by Picatinny Arsenal Engineer for the Explosive and Propellant Research Laboratory, at estimated cost of $13,000; and by A–E firm Laurence Picone and Associates, Metuchen, N.J., for the Plastics Research Laboratory at a cost of $30,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What portion of the research and development work done at this arsenal could not be performed in other Government agencies or by private industry or colleges?

Mr. VAN KUREN. This has for many years been our central commodity arsenal for the R. & D. of explosives and propellants and in recent years in the area of plastics. We have no other research and development installation engaged in this activity.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What portion of the research and development work done here could be done in other Government agencies or by private industry? Have you done anything toward looking into that possibility?

Mr. VAN KUREN. As a matter of fact, interservice support is constantly under study. Picatinny has been engaged in support of the other services, the Navy and the Air Force, in its proper phase.

General SEEMAN. We have a statement on page 23, Mr. Chairman, that a large part of this research is for the Army, Air Force, and Atomic Energy Commission.

There is no question but what research can be done at other places. The question of how much you do inhouse and how much you do by contract is always a moot question.

One of the problems is that to properly supervise, to properly administer a contract, as you well know, for something done outside, you have to have a certain number of people and highly qualified people who can sit down and talk to the civilian contractor in their own language and with a certain degree of authority, and these people being what they are, and also time being what it is, and making use of previously existing facilities, this leads to a certain proportion of the work done inhouse.

Then there is the other consideration of certain research which has no civilian counterpart whatsoever in the realm of our newer explosives so you have no choice except to do it yourself or completely underwrite a civilian contractor starting from scratch.

Mr. JONAS. Is this really a good location for research and testing of explosive missiles with nuclear potentials?

Mr. VAN KUREN. Picatinny Arsenal is located in an extremely hilly section so that the surrounding hills protect the area completely around it. We think it is ideal for this purpose. The only direction an accidental explosion could go would be up.

Mr. JONAS. Where is the nearest city?

Mr. VAN KUREN. About 3 to 4 miles to Dover, N.J., which is possibly 45 miles out of New York City.

General SEEMAN. It is in the hilly north and northwest section of New Jersey, sir.

Mr. VAN KUREN. It was selected because of the protection of those surrounding hills.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, in selecting a location for this type of project you consider the proximity of population because of the possibility of an accident?

Mr. VAN KUREN. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This type of operation has its potential hazard.

Mr. VAN KUREN. Picatinny goes back to Revolutionary days when a private——

Mr. JONAS. There was not as much danger then as there is today with nuclear explosions, although I believe the Du Pont factory blew up once.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why should the unit cost for one set of laboratories for high-explosive work be $21 a square foot while the one for plastics research is $36.75 a square foot? What is the reason for the difference?

General SEEMAN. They are both additions and modifications of existing buildings. I have no specific answer on that.

Mr. NORWOOD. I can only look to the user to state the requirements.

Mr. VAN KUREN. Experimental laboratories for explosives work consist largely of a box surrounded by heavily barricaded walls with one end left weak so it can blow out in that direction. There are many small cubicles of that nature here, whereas in the plastics field you get more into a centralized laboratory with heating and machine facilities which is a more elaborate facility.

General SEEMAN. In the plastics research laboratory you may have more supporting facilities for different gases, air pressure, oxygen lines, higher percentage of air conditioning and mechanical ventilation to properly get the air changes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, there is a reasonably complete differential in structural requirements by and between the two operations. Is that correct?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice in your justifications of other military facilities considered in connection with Picatinny's laboratory addition that you did not consider the Naval Weapons Plant in Washington which has an active plastic laboratory. What consideration did you give to this facility based on the economic and political heat brought on you?

Mr. VAN KUREN. I don't know what specific consideration there has been given.

General SEEMAN. We will get a statement from the Ordnance Corps and insert it.

(The statement referred to follows:)

CONSIDERATION OF EXISTING INACTIVE GOVERNMENT FACILITIES

1. Prior to programing the construction of new facilities, the suitability and practicability of use of existing Government-owned facilities, wheresoever located, is considered carefully. This is in accordance with established policies and directives of the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army.

2. In the specific case of ordnance facilities, proposed for funding in fiscal year 1961, consideration of inactive installations or portions thereof in the District of Columbia was not carried to the point of detailed examination of these facilities because of the obvious impracticability of transferring any of the activities concerned to the Washington area. Reasons for such impracticability are:

(*a*) Support facilities relate directly to existing facilities and activities at the installation where programed.

(*b*) Research and development facilities represent relatively minor additions to technical activities established for many years in permanent installations.

(*c*) In addition to the above, three of these projects involve inherent explosive hazard which could not be located in a metropolitan area.

PUEBLO ORDNANCE DEPOT, COLO.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pueblo Ordnance Depot. This is reflected on page 27 of our justifications.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Pueblo Ordnance Depot	Colorado	Permanent	Col-5
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Pueblo, 14 miles W	Pueblo	Ordnance	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Ammunition Storage & Distribution		1942	Active

II - MISSION

Receives and stores general supplies and ammunition (excluding Chemical Corps toxic ammunition). Receives and stores repair parts, supplies, tools and equipment used to support Guided Missiles, anti-aircraft artillery and related fire control materiel for issue to all installations west of the Mississippi River (including Rock Island Arsenal) and overseas areas served by the Pacific Coast Army Terminals. Receives and stores special weapons materiel, propellants and explosive components of Guided Missiles (excluding Chemical Corps toxic ammunition). Performs functional packing of small arms ammunition. Performs surveillance testing of ammunition. Performs depot maintenance of artillery, fire control materiel, Guided Missile materiel, etc.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	32	27	3576		3635
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	25	24	4096		4145

IV - INVENTORY

	LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED		20,536	$ 78,970	$ 27,336,244	$ 27,415,214
2. LEASED		4,305	($ 345)		$ 0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959				(Except Land Rent)	$ 27,415,214
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY					$ 1,843,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST					$ 369,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION					$ 23,676,000
7. GRAND TOTAL					$ 53,303,214

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30 Jun59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30Jun59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
141	32	Special Weapons Support Fac	28	DLR	0	LS	0	LS	369	0	369	369

27

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Preliminary design is 100 percent complete, by A-E firm, Arrowhead Engineering, Inc., Denver, Colo.; design cost, $15,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What other facilities exist in the western part of the United States to support this mission?

Mr. VAN KUREN. No other Army facilities.

General SEEMAN. Pueblo is one of the three or four in the Ordnance Corps which have been selected in various locations, eastern, central, and western, of which Pueblo is the western one to do this job.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words there is no other acceptable facility in the western section of the United States?

General SEEMAN. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is this a central location for the area to be served?

Mr. VAN KUREN. Geographically in the center of the area being serviced.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You refer to a planned expansion of the NIKE-HERCULES activities. What do you mean by that reference?

General SEEMAN. There is no expansion of the program currently envisaged in this weapons system, Mr. Chairman. This is merely the accommodation of the repair and service facilities as these weapons go into the system. They are coming back for periodic inspection and spare parts stockage and checking. This depot has to be modified to accommodate this function.

Mr. VAN KUREN. That may also apply to the application of the nuclear warheads of the HERCULES missiles.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Those are the basic reasons for the expansion?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

REDSTONE ARSENAL, ALA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall pick up Redstone Arsenal shown on page 29 of the justifications.

DATE 1 Mar 1960
DEPARTMENT ARMY
FISCAL YEAR 1961
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

FISCAL YEAR: 1961 | DEPARTMENT: ARMY | DATE: 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO
Redstone Arsenal	Alabama	Permanent	Ala-6

5. NEAREST CITY	6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)	7. COMMAND
Huntsville, 10 miles NE	Madison	Ordnance

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
Guided Missile and Rocket Research and Development, Training, Depot Industrial Procurement, and Field Service	1942	Active

II - MISSION

The U.S. Army Ordnance Missile Command is responsible for the management of ballistic missile system, guided missile system, rocket system, and such other missile weapon systems as may be specifically assigned, and certain special mission responsibility of national importance for missile weapon systems, special missiles and/or vehicles and scientific programs. The U.S. Army Ordnance Guided Missile School is responsible for conducting individual training of military, allied military and civilian personnel in the guided missile field as prescribed by the U.S. Army Ordnance Training Command Operating Program and activates, organizes and trains Ordnance guided missile units as directed by the U.S. Army Ordnance Training Command.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	868	3106	12,701		16,675
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	730	2707	9,869		13,306

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	38,781	$ 2,048,140	$ 112,749,743	$ 114,797,883
2. LEASED	45	(@ 75)	0	$ 0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959			(Except Land Rent)	$ 114,797,883
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 29,071,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 1,000,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 176,687,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 321,555,883

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)				
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDS. 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
730	174	Fire and Rescue Station (Airfield)	30	SY	0	2,764	0	2,764	82	0	82	82
851	178	Extend Martin Road	31	SY	2,343,061	29,400	0	29,400	743	0	743	743
871	138	Water Storage	32	MGD	1.7	0.6	0	0.6	175	0	175	175
										TOTAL	1000	1,000
					29							

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

(See note at top of following page.)

Preliminary design for these items at Redstone is 100 percent complete. Design is by the district engineer, Mobile, Ala., for the fire and rescue station at cost of $4,000, and for the water storage at cost of $9,000. Design for Martin Road is by Ewin Engineering Co., Mobile, Ala., at a cost of $40,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will a two-lane road be adequate to meet the traffic needs of this area for the future? If so for how long in the future?

Mr. VAN KUREN. Studies made by the arsenal and by the Bureau of Public Roads indicate a two-lane road will not take care of the anticipated future load.

At the present time we feel that a two-lane road will be fully utilized when built. At a later time it will be necessary to add another two lanes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. As long as you ultimately contemplate a four-lane operation what have you done toward looking into the possibility of using the Federal aid highway program or looking to the local political subdivisions?

General SEEMAN. There is in our access road program under our general authorization an approved access road which, as you know, is administered by the Bureau of Public Roads which comes up to the reservation boundary.

This has been planned and it is ready to go. It has been held up pending our determination of the MCA requirement within the reservation boundary.

This, too, has been held up by the current review and the relation of the Army requirements at Redstone compared to that area which is transferred to NASA.

On the basis of that we have come to the conclusion at this time that this was a companion project and a reasonable program.

Mr. JONAS. Will not your traffic be reduced as you move 3,500 people over to NASA?

General SEEMAN. No, sir; plans and programs of NASA for increasing their requirements indicate no reduction.

Mr. JONAS. No reduction in your population?

General SEEMAN. There has been a transfer.

Mr. JONAS. You do not replace these people you are giving up?

General SEEMAN. No, we will not replace them.

Mr. VAN KUREN. They will continue to work in exactly the same locations where they have been working for us. NASA has indicated informally they expect to increase their people.

Mr. JONAS. I have different information. They are asking the other committee on which I serve for money to build administration buildings and laboratories at a different location.

General SEEMAN. In the review and determination of the facilities required for the NASA group versus what was required for the continued Army ballistic missile agency and guided missile agency there were two requirements on which a King Solomon's decision had to be made.

The Army retained the administration building, NASA retained a computer building. In this missile business computing is a very important requirement.

As I understand it now, through other channels, NASA has requested and is considering what they need for an administration building.

Mr. JONAS. They have it in the program.

General SEEMAN. There is a requirement, and we do not have it in this program, for a computer building. That requirement is looking over our shoulder.

Mr. JONAS. Do they still use this same access road?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir. The town of Huntsville is to the northwest and there is now one main road which goes into town. That is Patton Road. Martin Road is the one tied to this extension we are requesting to give an alternate route into town.

Mr. JONAS. You will have to make this one-way traffic; will you not?

General SEEMAN. Right now they are using staggered hours in the daily work requirement on Patton Road. That probably will be continued and certain parts made one way during the rush hour.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Martin Road now leads up to the reservation. You are requesting funds to have your road from the reservation line carried internally.

Mr. VAN KUREN. Looking at a map of this reservation, Patton Road runs north and south. Martin Road runs from Patton Road to the west. The facilities——

Mr. SHEPPARD. This is what you are asking for?

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. From where the Bureau of Public Roads picks up is this a four-lane road?

Mr. VAN KUREN. It is my understanding that the Bureau of Public Roads is designing a four-lane divided highway but will build only two lanes at this time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The road for which you are asking will handle your capacity requirements down to the termination of the access road, which the Bureau of Public Roads contemplates constructing?

Mr. VAN KUREN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You will not have to come back here 2 years from now and ask for another widening of that road?

General SEEMAN. Not unless there is some great expansion in the program at Huntsville Arsenal and the ABMA which might require us to come before you.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you are going through a swamp area you have problems on your hand compared to construction on more solid terrain.

Mr. NORWOOD. That is right.

Mr. VAN KUREN. At least four different routes were carefully considered through that area to get the most economical area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions?

UTILIZATION OF EXISTING FACILITIES

Mr. SIKES. Both the Air Force and Navy tell us they will have to close some bases in the next year or two. To what extent have you people examined a list of those bases that are projected for closing in order to determine whether they are usable insofar as the Army is concerned and to what extent facilities at those bases can be substituted for new construction elsewhere? This may not be a practical thing but there are a number of instances where considerable money has been spent. Perhaps you could use existing facilities which

belong to one of the other services in lieu of part of the construction now projected for the Army and thereby avoid this expenditure.

Have you made any effort to determine that possibility?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir; we do it in two ways. First, before the using service——

Mr. SIKES. Answer my question specifically, please. Have you examined a list of the bases that the Air Force and Navy say they will close to determine whether you could use those?

General SEEMAN. We have not seen any overall list, sir. We hear of one base at a time.

Mr. SIKES. The answer is no, you have not explored this possibility before you come before us to ask for this money?

General SEEMAN. We have occasions in the shop right now where the Air Force is seeking our views as to the possibility of taking over installations. I am thinking of one in Alaska. These cases come up informally.

The Navy inquired as to a base some 6 or 7 months ago in Louisiana, for example.

Wherever there is a possibility that they can be used, either in toto or in part, without increasing costs, they are used.

Mr. SIKES. Give us some illustrations, if you can, where such bases have actually been used. We hear this each year but we do not think much has been done about it.

You say you have not examined the current list of bases to be closed, and yet you are here asking for a considerable amount of money.

It would make this committee feel better about the situation if we knew you examined the bases which are scheduled for closing to determine whether you can, by using those bases, or parts of them, avoid some of these expenditures.

Mr. VAN KUREN. I would like to point to the justification sheet with respect to Picatinny Arsenal in this program. This will show we have examined the capabilities of Fort Monmouth, the Brooklyn Navy Yard, Raritan Arsenal, and other installations which we thought might have capability of assisting in this area, but this was not the case.

Mr. SIKES. Did you look at the Navy Weapons Plant here?

Mr. VAN KUREN. With respect to what, sir?

Mr. SIKES. Picatinny Arsenal?

Mr. VAN KUREN. No, sir.

Mr. SIKES. I do not think you look very far in your efforts to avoid new expenditures, to be very frank. Your answers have not convinced me that you do.

Mr. VAN KUREN. Picatinny Arsenal deals in high explosives and is located in a hilly section for a specific reason.

Mr. SIKES. That is a good answer for this specific case and I will not quarrel with it.

Have you looked at the Navy Weapons Plant as a substitute for anything else that you propose to construct in the list before us?

Mr. VAN KUREN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. How did you consider it briefly, over a cup of coffee, or did you check out every possible requirement?

Mr. VAN KUREN. We have a specific facility investment at Redstone Arsenal which involves about $150 million to $200 million of

technical facilities all engaged in one technical field. To ask ourselves whether we could take one specific facility requirement and put it into a facility such as the Naval Weapons Plant the answer is obvious.

Mr. SIKES. That applies to Redstone Arsenal, but perhaps you have 100 other bases on which you propose construction. Did you go through each of the requirements of facilities at each base in the same manner?

Mr. VAN KUREN. Yes, sir. Whether we made a detailed study the answer would be "No." However, in every case we have required our programing people to consider not only our own installations in other parts of the country but all installations. We also have them check other Government facilities in practically all cases.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am glad the gentleman from Florida has gone into this. I am sorely distressed at the answers given here. It seems the services have not learned a thing since World War II.

In World War II, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from California, the Navy came up and asked for some 200 facilities.

We asked them why they were not using abandoned Army facilities.

Mr. Sheppard asked the Army to come up when the Navy came back with a letter from the Army that they had not abandoned facilities.

I told the then Under Secretary of War Patterson that and he said, "We certainly have."

It developed we had inadvertently used the word "abandoned" and they had used the word "vacated."

This is the tragic part of that: The Assistant Secretary of War came down and submitted to the Navy 160-plus facilities to start with, later more than 200. The Assistant Secretary of War said, "We didn't know what you wanted when you asked about 'abandonment.' When you asked us what we had abandoned or vacated, we didn't know. We had to go to the field."

The Army itself did not know what it had vacated.

If I interpret your answers here, this is a day-to-day sort of thing and insofar as anybody having told you about this type of facility, where you could look at these facilities you have.

At that time the Assistant Secretary of War said they had a committee, a joint committee of the services, to clear these uses. He said until we raised that point that that committee through 3 years never had had a meeting, but they met continuously for about a month after we called it to their attention.

It sounds here as though there is as poor a coordination among the services as there was at that time.

Mr. JONAS. I for one, as a member of this subcommittee, am satisfied that the services now, before they decide to close out an installation, canvass the other services to see whether they can use it, but that is not what we are talking about. We would like to see you be able to say that you do not wait on another service to give up something but as you plan expansion you take the initiative and search out what the other services have.

General SEEMAN. This is done. The Department of Defense keeps this up all the time. We come up with a request not knowing what

other services are thinking about. They toss it back into our teeth frequently.

I will recall one case for you where the Air Force was considering Camp McCoy for a missile base. True, it got quite acrimonious at one time as to whose intentions were what.

This is a major training camp located in Wisconsin.

Later on it was determined that the foundation and the location for the missile base was not any good, anyway.

There are cases, such as Campbell Air Force Base. We had some facilities for the airborne division. It became known that the Air Force was going to inactivate Campbell Air Force Base and we took it over.

The same thing occurred with regard to Parks Air Force Base in California where we have completely taken over Parks. Stoneman is being put up as surplus.

Mr. WHITTEN. The point we make is not failure to pass on something you learn about and see, but the question is whether you merge future planning of the services so that you see in advance and work in advance prior to building. You sit down and wait until you learn of something and it is submitted to you. Then it is too late to deal with it.

The amount of surplus we have is atrocious. It shows me there is a complete lack of projected planning as to use between the services.

General SEEMAN. We appreciate the concern and we are tremendously concerned, too.

One of the problems in this age is that present things are not in the right place at the right time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Do you have a joint committee to which all this planning is submitted or are you merely dependent on the top layer of defense?

General SEEMAN. Generally in the Department of Defense, in any one of these programs, there are three segments which come into it.

We go up for construction and real estate which goes through Mr. Bryant, the Assistant Secretary for Installation. It will certainly go to the Comptroller as to what is adequate to put in each year.

When you get into a specialized nature, such as research and development and new weapons, it goes to Defense Research and Engineering, Dr. York and his approval.

If it is medical it goes to another central group.

Mr. WHITTEN. Give us a list, with the chairman's permission, of each facility that either the Air Force or the Navy has submitted to you, a list of facilities which they have planned to abandon in the future. There we can see whether you are dealing with future development or whether you are waiting until you hear about it.

General SEEMAN. If I may respectfully say this, there is no such list. This is like a period of incubation of the egg. When you discuss these various installations they are so delicate——

Mr. WHITTEN. You mean the base is delicate? They call all Members of Congress, put it in the paper, and have everybody at home there. It is not delicate.

General SEEMAN. You are exactly correct, when they reach the decision of which one of a number actually is to be fingered.

Mr. WHITTEN. In my opinion the services have not learned a thing since World War II in this area.

If you do not have a competent reviewing authority and have no such list in connection with this planning we are right back where the Secretary of the Army said we were then.

Mr. SIKES. This is a situation which does not appear to have been given much consideration in the Department of Defense. Information on projected closings is available even to the general public now.

Certainly it is not a secret in the Department of Defense. I would like to have something from the Department of Defense to show that even at this late date they are going into this matter more carefully. The Navy and the Air Force know what bases they are planning to close. It is time they let the other services know the location of those bases so that they can determine whether there is a possibility of using some of those facilities in lieu of some of these we are asked to build.

General SEEMAN. The big consideration, sir, is the fact that to run one of these bases requires something over $4 to $5 to $6 million a year.

What we are asking normally is a small division of a few hundred thousand.

Mr. SIKES. I understand the Army cannot take over a big air base for a minor activity or a small addition or replacement. Perhaps there is nothing in Air and Navy programs that is usable, but there may be some part of this program of yours which can be put into one of those smaller installations or part of a larger installation in lieu of building new facilities. This is something this committee would like to feel has been explored as fully as possible.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The chairman is under the impression, gentleman, that when it comes to a declaration of inactivity on the part of the Army, Air Force, and Navy or Marine Corps that it has to be acquiesced in at the DOD level.

General SEEMAN. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Obviously, while there should be an interservice relationship here, there has to be some centralized place for determination.

When Mr. Bryant comes up here we will really get into this in detail.

Mr. SIKES. He should be alerted we will want this information.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think he should be advised of the fact we will inquire quite closely into what is being done along this line.

As you have well stated, General, many of your requests are not comparable to what we have in these other locations. As I understand this situation, there are certain operations in certain geographical areas which can be done only there. If you broke it into sections you undoubtedly would interfere with the required function of that particular operation. To that degree those things have to be carefully surveyed.

Again we go back to one basic thing—somewhere, somehow, in the Department of Defense there should be a constant review made of these things. There should be continuity of requirement.

By utilizing that process I think you would narrow down the field and do a more efficient job than you would by trying to operate on an individual service level. I think there should be more stress put on this and we will speak to that when Mr. Bryant comes up here.

A year or a year and a half ago I addressed a communication to the Department of Defense. And I stated this should get more definite attention.

As of the moment I do not know what has been done in that particular department to take care of this kind of situation. However, when Mr. Bryant comes up here we shall inquire into it and find out more about it.

It is apparent from the testimony we have here this morning, and you are not alone, that it is a sort of loose end operation at the moment.

General SEEMAN. Our military construction is so small, and I still appreciate your review for the benefit of the entire population of the country, but our military construction segment is so small we will leave no stone unturned to fulfill some of those requirements if there is anything existing available.

(Discussion held off the record.)

UMATILLA ORDNANCE DEPOT, OREG.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is the "Umatilla Ordnance Depot" appearing on page 33 of the justifications.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Umatilla Ordnance Depot	Oregon	Permanent	Ore-3
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental) COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Hermister, 6 miles SE	Morrow and Umatilla	Ordnance	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Ammunition Storage and Distribution		1941	Active

II - MISSION

Receives, stores and distributes general supplies and ammunition. Stores strategic and critical General Services Administration materials as directed by the Chief of Ordnance. Performs depot maintenance, modification, renovation, demilitarization and surveillance on ammunition.

*One time cost for easement.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	8	0	547		555
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	8	0	872		880

IV - INVENTORY

	LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED		17,211	$ 13,290	$ 34,812,512	$ 34,825,802
2. LEASED		2,649	rs 4,955*)	0	$ 4,955
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959			(Except Land Rent)		$ 34,830,757
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY					$ 0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST					$ 319,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION					$ 8,410,000
7. GRAND TOTAL					$ 43,522,757

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30June59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30Jun59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
872	30	Physical Security Facs	34	LF	166,177	17,100	0	17,100	319	0	319	319

33

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE

Preliminary design by the district engineer, Seattle, Wash., is 20 percent complete; design cost, $16,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will this installation remain a part of the ordnance establishment for the future insofar as you know?

General SEEMAN. That is correct, sir. This request at Umatilla is in the Northwest part of the country. Its mission is comparable to that at Blue Grass, which we discussed previously.

WATERTOWN ARSENAL, MASS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is the Watertown Arsenal appearing on page 36 of the justifications.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM
FISCAL YEAR 1961
DEPARTMENT ARMY
DATE 1 MAY 1960

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Watertown Arsenal	Massachusetts	Permanent	Mass-801
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Boston, 6 miles E	Middlesex	Technical Services	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Research & development and manufacturing of Ordnance materiel		1816	Active

II - MISSION

Watertown Arsenal is the principal development, engineering and manufacturing installation in the field of anti-aircraft artillery weapons, heavy field artillery towed weapons (except cannon and fire controls), and rocket launchers, surface to air (except fire control and special purpose vehicles). The major part of its support effort is presently devoted to the development, engineering, and manufacture of rocket and missile launchers (surface to surface) and special weapons.

In addition, special mission assignments of Watertown Arsenal are:

a. Basic and supporting research on ferrous metals and alloys; uranium, beryllium, and other transitional metals and

(contd)

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	17	4	2778		2799
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	19	15	2774		2808

IV - INVENTORY

	LAND (ACRES)	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	119	$ 446,294	$ 19,573,164	$ 20,019,458
2. LEASED	0	( )		$ 0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959 (Except Land Rent)				$ 20,019,458
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 1,849,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 10,853,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 32,721,458

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY					PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)				
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30June59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30June59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30June59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m	
310	16	Physical Metallurgy Facilities	38	SF	6,600	8,640	0	8,640	275	0	275	275	219
310	17	Conversion of Building 292 to Lab	40	SF	236,703	26,560	0	26,560	1,041	0	1,041	1,041	166
310	18	Convert Building 312 to Laboratory	43	SF	0	28,800	0	28,800	533	0	533	533	201
										TOTAL	1,849	1,849	

36

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

(See top of following page for note.)

Preliminary design for the building conversions is 100 percent complete by architect-engineer firm, Jackson & Moreland, Boston, Mass.; design cost, $40,000 for building 292, and $19,000 for building 312. Preliminary design of the physical metallurgy facilities is 20 percent by New England division engineer; design cost, $10,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has the nuclear reactor at this installation already been constructed and is it in operation?

General SEEMAN. It is not yet in operation. I will ask Mr. Van Kuren to respond to that question.

Mr. VAN KUREN. I suspect it is not. It is getting awfully close. It is either about ready to be put in operation or it has been put in operation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When the record comes down, if you can obtain the information as to when it will be in operation, will you put that in the record, please.

Mr. VAN KUREN. Surely.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What work contemplated here in the field of physical metallurgy and that contemplated in building 292 is not being done or cannot be done in other Government facilities or in private business or institutions?

Mr. VAN KUREN. A lot of that work is not being done nor could be done in existing ordnance facilities. We simply do not have the facilities for it. This work also ties into the overall materials research mission assigned to Watertown Arsenal which is to go into fields in which there is no commercial counterpart which have a specific military significance and requirement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has the construction of these additional Government facilities been approved by everyone in the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget under Circular 60-2, so there is no question that the Government work will be taken from the hands of private industry as contemplated on page 44 of your justifications and done in Government plants?

General SEEMAN. All these projects were approved by the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget, sir, in consideration of that policy and circular.

There is an honest difference of opinion as to what is a commercial article. Is it something that you buy off the shelf, or is it commercial to the extent that you underwrite a private contractor's construction of a building and they do the work and then you buy it? Is it commercially available or is it a commercial availability? There is an honest difference of opinion in much of this. Certainly with regard to laundries and dry cleaning plants, this is commercial.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I do not see why, gentlemen, extreme mental effort is required to draw lines of demarcation in that field. Either those facilities are there or they are not. Any officer who has been in command of a post any length of time knows what facilities are in the municipalities adjacent thereto within 50 miles. Why should there be any difficulty in determination? I do not understand.

General SEEMAN. These local commanders and the Chief of Ordnance have examined that. Considering the requirements of the projects which are in being in the Watertown Arsenal and the capabilities and the cost of transferring what they are doing out somewhere, they are convinced this is the most advantageous approach.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If it is on that basis that is fine, but I am still a little bit at a loss as to why we should have a question in our minds about the determination of one versus the other. It is either a shelf item or it is not. If we want to buy off the self, either it is available or it is not.

General SEEMAN. Perhaps I used the wrong expression in saying "off the shelf." When you get into research and development activity, it is not really comparable to an off-the-shelf item.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The transfer of the work here has been approved, you stated, by DOD?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir. I have a note here, Mr. Chairman, that the completion date for the reactor was April 1960, which reinforces Mr. Van Kuren's statement.

WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE, N. MEX.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is the White Sands Missile Range appearing on page 45 of your justifications.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
White Sands Missile Range	New Mexico	Permanent	NM-2
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Las Cruces, 27 miles SW	Dona Ana, Otero, Sierra, Lincoln, Socorro	Ordnance Corps	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Research and Development, Guided Missiles and Rockets		1945	Active

II - MISSION

White Sands Missile Range is the principal Ordnance Corps installation for the execution of all technical and engineering responsibilities associated with flight testing of guided missiles, rockets and other munitions which may be assigned for Ordnance engineering and acceptance testing and for the general supervision and coordination as pertains to scheduling, range safety, and instrumentation of all flight testing performed there for either contractor or user test purposes.

* Includes $510 one time cost for easement.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	398	3743	4681		8822
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	289	2929	2896		6114

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	666,536	$ 0	$ 63,673,546	$ 63,673,546
2. LEASED	131,556	($ 175,614*)		$ 510
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959			(Except Land Rent)	$ 63,674,056
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 17,700,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 1,233,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 87,509,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 170,116,056

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)				
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDS 30 Jun59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDS 30Jun59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m	
131	170	Telephone Exchange Building	46	SF	3,843	10,000	0	10,000	273	0	273	273	2.21
812	89	Electric Power for Range Instrumentation	48	MI	226	321	0	68	4500	0	960	960	2.22
										TOTAL	1,233	1,233	

45

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Preliminary design for the telephone exchange building is 10 percent complete, by A–E contractor, Louis G. Hessolden, Albuquerque, N. Mex.; design cost, $14,000. Design not started for electric power for range instrumentation; design cost estimated at $48,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for telephone exchange building at this installation at the present time, and what will be done with these facilities when the new one is built?

General SEEMAN. At the present time at White Sands, sir, the telephone exchange is in a small section of the headquarters building, which was built for administrative space. Before coming in with this request they studied the possibility of expansion in that building, expansion of an ancillary communications facility which I believe is in a quonset hut at White Sands, or this request for a new, integrated telephone exchange building. This has been recommended as the most advantageous one.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have forgotten at the moment—perhaps your shopping list will indicate the answer—the present size of the board there insofar as what is commonly known as its call ability.

General SEEMAN. The present exchange is a 2,600-line system, and it will be increased by 600 lines in an emergency project during fiscal 1961. These lines will be installed in hallways and converted offices at the present headquarters building which, when the new building is constructed, will revert to office and administrative space.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, it is an additional 600 over and above the present capacity.

General SEEMAN. This is just to take care of the immediate requirements. The present exchange is operating at 98 percent of capacity.

Mr. VAN KUREN. Further expansion is contemplated in fiscal year 1962 of another 1,300 lines. The 600 lines is an emergency job going in this year.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the square footage involved for the 600 additional lines to provide space for the mechanical devices going into the building coming up to 1962, as you see it now, with another requirement of 1,300 lines? Without putting the mechanical devices in now, what would be the additional cost to add the concrete, the bricks, and mortar for the 1,300 lines and letting them stand negative until that time comes; doing it now as compared to a new contract?

General SEEMAN. I do not think Mr. Norwood can answer that, and I cannot, either. It would require the conversion of additional space in General Laidlaw's headquarters building which just is not available to expand beyond this emergency tacking on of 600 lines, which is an immediate necessity.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is obvious that if it will not stand the expansion now because of disturbing the command function, it will still disturb that operation or function when they go for 1,300.

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir, but the new one will be built for a total of 4,500 from the beginning.

Mr. Chairman, I might mention that in our total request this year there is a total of six of these more-or-less communication buildings. White Sands being the first one, it highlights the general proposition that we have. The question of telephone exchanges was gone into very thoroughly with the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget. At first we were pessimistic as to how we would accom-

modate this requirement, but after it was reviewed we have six of them in this bill, and the requests are before you.

Mr. SHEPPARD. My question more or less points to this one factor. Once we have determined that ultimately, within a reasonable span of time, we must have so much service and so much space, then the question from the economic point of view resolves itself down to one thing: If we know we must have it in 1962, for example, what will be the difference in the cost by doing it now? I am not too much interested in the inconvenience to the command as such, but in the cost. It is merely a matter of engineering the cost factor within the tight budget.

General SEEMAN. We would like to do it for another reason, Mr. Chairman. The 600-line expansion probably comes out of M. & O. funds and not construction funds, which are also very tight.

Mr. SHEPPARD. So there goes maintenance right down the hill on another item.

What is the basis for your statement that over 500 additional people will be required in this area due to the expanded NIKE–ZEUS work? What particular aspect of NIKE–ZEUS is that?

Mr. VAN KUREN. The early stage testing of the NIKE–ZEUS missile is now underway at White Sands Proving Ground, and this activity increases as our tests go into longer range.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much missile flight data has been lost as a result of the present power system at this installation? Do you know?

Mr. VAN KUREN. I will supply the answer to that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Supply that when the record comes down, if you will, please.

Mr. VAN KUREN. Yes, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

1. On any given mission there will be from 50 to 60 stations functioning. With generator power, on an average, 2 to 3 percent of these stations will fail to function properly. The value of the "shoot" will not however be lost, because the data can be obtained (though at substantial additional cost) in data reduction, by interpolating the data from other stations.

2. There are certain key stations at which timing and mathematical data are gathered, and from which other data is computed. Failure of these stations would destroy the value of the data. At these stations (about 30), standby generators are provided to be sure that power will keep the stations operating. Despite all precautions taken, there were six cancellations of missions due to generators going out, during 1959. In addition, it is estimated that there were 50 missions rescheduled with a delay of an average of 1 hour each, due to generator troubles. In this connection, the cost of operating each range has been estimated at $27,500 per hour.

3. Cost of operating generators is estimated as follows (per generator):

	Per year
Organizational maintenance	$550
Field and depot maintenance, direct labor only	250
Fuel	360
Transportation uprange	55

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is evident from your statement that you consider this requirement to be extremely essential. Why has it not been constructed before, and why does it have its present low position on the existing priority list? If we are in the field of missile requirements here, the testimony before another subcommittee indicates that, in my

language, the heat is on and we shall produce everything we can within the bounds of the dollars we have and as fast as we can.

General SEEMAN. The priority as we have it at the present time, Mr. Chairman, is 222 out of 282. It is not at the bottom of the list. It is not at the top, either. We might say that all of our items this year, because of the small size of the program, are top priority. This is a question. You put your finger on a very important point. The Signal Corps and the Ordnance Corps, in instrumenting this range and getting the power out to the various places where it is needed, do as much as they can within the limits of their small resources. Then they suddenly approach a situation where they really have to make a major improvement. That is the case of this electric power. They have determined that they have to go to a transmission line and get away from the heterogeneous diesel plants, interruption possibilities, and the high maintenance caused by sand and exposure and things like that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In getting away from the localized and heterogeneous facilities which are now used, which I am not objecting to at all, obviously we should keep many of them in a state of transferability because in other sections of the military functions we are being asked continuously for standby powerplants and minor contributions to what we call standby requirements. If they are made known with a reasonable degree of rapidity after they become unusable at this location, it might be they could be used at other places, and I would hope that at that time the function is a little more clarified than at present.

General SEEMAN. The Signal Corps and General Laidlaw, the commander out there, have stated that where they have to maintain a critical diesel plant in standby, they will maintain it, but generally they will go back into stock or use it elsewhere.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Installation summary

[In thousands]

	Prior authorization	Proposed authorization	Proposed funding
Quartermaster	0	$5,486	$5,486
Atlanta General Depot, Ga	0	365	365
Fort Lee, Va	0	577	577
New Cumberland General Depot, Pa	0	89	89
Quartermaster Research and Engineering Center, Mass	0	3,628	3,628
Richmond Quartermaster Depot, Va	0	609	609
Sharpe General Depot, Calif	0	218	218

ATLANTA GENERAL DEPOT, GA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we shall turn to the next operation, gentlemen, the Quartermaster Corps, as shown on page 52 of our justifications. The first item is the Atlanta General Depot, the request for which is shown on page 53.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Atlanta General Depot	Georgia	Permanent	Ga-3
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Atlanta, 12 miles NW	Clayton	Quartermaster	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Depot		1941	Active

II - MISSION

Supply-distribution responsibility for Engineer, Quartermaster, Transportation, and Signal items and overseas distribution for Engineer and Quartermaster items. Engineer, Medical, Ordnance, Quartermaster and Transportation responsibility for receipt, storage and shipment of reserve stocks. Engineers and Medical assembly missions. Quartermaster special mission storage of baggage and household effects. Engineer and Ordnance depot maintenance. Transportation 4th Echelon field maintenance Army aircraft and 3rd Echelon back-up support Third Army area, cross-service agreements. Training in depot supply and maintenance for military personnel.

*One time cost for easement.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	58	64	3215		3337
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	63	102	3833		3998

IV - INVENTORY

	LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1.	OWNED	1,488	$ 173,784	$28,581,642	$ 28,755,426
2.	LEASED	1	($ 91*)		$ 91
3.	INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959 (Except Land Rent)				$ 28,755,517
4.	AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 1,579,000
5.	AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 365,000
6.	ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 591,000
7.	GRAND TOTAL				$ 31,290,517

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30Jun59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
211	34	Aircraft Maint Shop - Conversion	54	SF	0	175,077	35,630	139,447	1,047	684	365	365 *225
					53							

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Preliminary design is 75 percent complete by district engineer, Savannah, Ga.; design cost, $10,000.

60

Mr. SHEPPARD. What consideration have you given to having this aircraft maintenance work done at other locations or under contract in private industry?

General SEEMAN. This has been thoroughly considered by the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics on the Army Staff as well as the Quartermaster General, who has the responsibility at the Atlanta General Depot. Furthermore, it was reviewed by Defense and Bureau of the Budget. In the Bureau of the Budget hearings it was actually suggested that the Army consider the possibility of having this done by, for example, Brookley Air Force Base, which is in Mobile. Here again, the small operation considered for the Army requirements at the central location of Atlanta General Depot just could not undertake the consideration of a major base at some distance away in the vicinity of Mobile. This is where the aircraft parts are kept, and the plan is for the first and second echelon maintenance under the users and the organizations to follow in to the depot, and the fourth and fifth echelon maintenance to be here at Atlanta.

This supports the 3d Army area. The staff has considered for this echelon of maintenance armywide, in the Southeast it is Atlanta General Depot, in the Southwest it is the Fort Worth General Depot, and in California it is the general depot in the vicinity of Stockton.

FORT LEE, VA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is Fort Lee, Va.

Preliminary design is 75 percent complete by district engineer, Savannah, Ga.; design cost, $10,000.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Fort Lee	Virginia	Permanent	Va-4
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Petersburg, 3 miles NE	Prince George	Quartermaster	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Quartermaster Training Command		1917	Active

II - MISSION

To exercise control over all Quartermaster Corps training activities in the field within limits and policies established by the Quartermaster General. To develop Quartermaster Corps field organizations and to prepare and disseminate training and operational doctrine, through appropriate channels. To provide administration, security, operational facilities service, and supply for all units, organizations, and activities stationed at Fort Lee, Virginia, and to provide required support to satellited activities.

*Includes $7325 one time cost for easement.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	237	5503	2702		8442
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	298	11002	703		14303

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	7,536	$ 1,050,091	$ 71,949,955	$ 63,000,047
2. LEASED	248	$ 10,605*		$ 7,325
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959 (Except Land Rent)				$ 63,007,371
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 10,274,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 577,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 92,923,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 166,781,371

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY					PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 30June59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 30June59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
610	68	2 Bn Hq & Storeroom Buildings	57	SF	10,356	51,680	5,178	10,356	1,000	101	214	214 (273)
823	20	Conversion Heating Plant - Ext Gas Distribution	58	DLR	0	LS	0	LS	363	0	363	363 (223)
										TOTAL	577	577

56

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Pr
plet
perc

V
buil
ties
C
rar
is a
to
tal
tiv
the
M
Wh
M
gra
C
M
thi
C
era
T
for
M
pot

Preliminary design by the District Engineer, Norfolk, Va., is 80 percent complete for the battalion buildings, with design cost estimated at $5,000; and 40 percent complete for heating plant, with design cost estimated at $10,000.

What are you using for battalion headquarters and storeroom buildings at the present time, and what will be done with these facilities if the new buildings are granted?

General SEEMAN. This function is being performed now in temporary buildings half a mile away from the permanent barracks. This is a case, sir, where the permanent barracks have been built, but due to price rises and other reasons it was not possible to build the battalion headquarters and storeroom. At the present time, administrative space is being provided either in the permanent building or at the older building some distance away.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see you have an item of $7,325 for an easement. What is the state of that easement at the moment, if you know?

Mr. WESTENBERGER. I might comment on that. In the 1960 program an effort is being made to fund one quartermaster easement.

General SEEMAN. To reprogram it in the 1960 program.

Mr. WESTENBERGER. We will provide something for the record on this.

General SEEMAN. There is a clearance easement at the Atlanta General Depot.

(The following was submitted later:)

The $7,325 for easement referred to by the chairman is a permanent easement for Fort Lee funded in prior years.

NEW CUMBERLAND GENERAL DEPOT, PA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is the "New Cumberland General Depot" appearing on page 59 of the justifications.

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
New Cumberland General Depot	Pennsylvania	Permanent	Pa-6
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
New Cumberland	York	Quartermaster	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
General Depot		1918	Active

II - MISSION

Receipt, storage and issue of all types of Quartermaster, Ordnance, Chemical, Engineer and Signal Corps supplies; 4th echelon maintenance and depot support CONUS Army aircraft.

* Includes $301 one time cost for easement.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	40	65	1599		1704
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	60	484	1223		1767

IV - INVENTORY

	LAND ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	881	$ 159,093	$ 24,093,420	$ 24,252,513
2. LEASED	33	($ 316*)		$ 301
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959 (Except Land Rent)				$ 24,252,814
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 1,095,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 89,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 12,801,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 38,237,814

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30Jun59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30Jun59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
141	9	Diesel Locomotive Shelter & Repair Shop	60	SF	0	3,100	0	3,100	89	0	89	89 227

59

DA FORM 1674-R. 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Design for this item has not been started; design cost is estimated at $5,000.

The request is for a diesel locomotive shelter and repair shop. What is your comment on that?

General SEEMAN. This is just a small locomotive shelter to accommodate the locomotives which are necessary to do the inhouse shifting at the New Cumberland General Depot. The one there at present is a very temporary frame and sheet iron building constructed in 1921, with not only hazardous working conditions but insufficient space around the locomotives to do the work at any season of the year, and during the winter season, when it is unheated and dark, it is much worse.

RICHMOND QUARTERMASTER DEPOT, VA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is the "Richmond Quartermaster Depot."

Design for this item has not been started; design cost is estimated at $5,000.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

FISCAL YEAR	DEPARTMENT	DATE
1961	ARMY	1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Richmond Quartermaster Depot	Virginia	Permanent	Va-3
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Richmond, 6 miles NE	Chesterfield	Quartermaster	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Depot		1942	

II - MISSION Provides headquarters, staff and administrative facilities for the Military General Supply Agency. Maintains centralized accountability for CONUS inventory of General Supplies, Non-Perishable Subsistance, Petroleum and Petroleum Handling Equipment, performs Stock Control functions for these categories for Richmond Quartermaster Depot and three other depots. Receives stores and issues or directs the issue of these categories for support of CONUS Army installations in First, Second and Fifth Army areas. Operates a centralized Data Processing Center, performs depot maintenance repair on QM equipment, and through the U.S. Army General Supplies Commodity Center exercises supply management of assigned QM General Supplies.

**One time cost for easement.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	118	53	1658		1829
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	105	41	2906		3052

IV - INVENTORY

	LAND ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	668	$ 255,985	$ 23,639,923	$ 23,895,908
2. LEASED	6	($ 1,001**)		$ 1,001
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959			(Except Land Rent)	$ 23,896,909
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 602,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 818,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 25,323,909

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30June59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30June59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
~~121~~	~~18~~	~~Communication Center (Bldg #33)~~	~~74~~	~~SF~~	~~1,480~~	~~4,960~~	~~0~~	~~4,960~~	~~121~~	~~0~~	~~131~~ 115	~~131~~
610	19	Conversion of Warehouse 32 to Administrative Space	76	SF	182,414	158,000	0	64,000	1,323	0	478 113	478
										TOTAL	~~609~~ 478	~~609~~ 478

*Includes Military General Supply Agency established as of 1 January 1960

73

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE

Design has not been started for the building conversion; design cost is estimated at $18,000.

Why was Richmond selected as the headquarters for the Military General Supply Agency, and what consideration has been given to other locations where existing facilities might have been more adequate for this purpose?

General SEEMAN. This requirement for the Army to assume the general managership of general supplies was a decision announced during January of this year, sir. The Quartermaster General studied the entire administrative and depot system to pick out the one which would be most responsible, best located, and require the least amount of adjustment. On that basis he selected Richmond.

Mr. Chairman, at your pleasure, I might mention that we are asking your permission to withdraw this first item, a communications center building. Due to the urgency of this new mission, we had to approve go-ahead of this item under the minor new construction MCA procedure. We are doing that. In addition, there will be a number of other items, a trainfire range at Fort Eustis, Va., certain of the signal oversea items——

Mr. SHEPPARD. Those changes have been made in the setup in the justifications.

General SEEMAN. Yes. I shall call attention to them as we go through.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Referring to the Richmond Quartermaster Depot, one more question: Is this all of the construction or rehabilitation which will be required as a result of the executive director of this agency being located at Richmond?

General SEEMAN. This is all we have knowledge of at this time, and it has been presented to us as their total needs to accommodate this function.

SHARPE GENERAL DEPOT, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is Sharpe General Depot appearing on page 77 of the justifications.

Design has not been started for the building conversion; design cost is estimated at $18,000.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Sharpe General Depot	California	Permanent	Cal-32
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Stockton, 7 miles S	San Joaquin	Quartermaster	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
General Depot		1942	Active

II - MISSION

Receipt, storage and issue of supplies and equipment for distribution within the Sixth U.S. Army Area and through the Pacific Transportation Terminal Command to Pacific and oversea theaters. Distribution depot for key and reserve Quartermaster, Engineer, Medical and Transportation supplies. Field storage point for Surgeon General rolling stock, the organizational maintenance of which is undertaken by the Vehicle Maintenance Branch of this depot. The Engineer, Medical and Transportation Supply Sections perform a depot maintenance mission. This installation has command responsibility for 11 national cemetaries west of the Mississippi.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	58	103	2560		2721
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	57	55	2730		2842

IV - INVENTORY

	LAND ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	1172	$ 206,991	$ 33,429,861	$ 33,636,852
2. LEASED	72	($ 1,393)		$ 0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959 (Except Land Rent)				$ 33,636,852
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 765,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 218,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 18,248,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 52,867,852

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDS. 30June59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDS. 30June59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
211	45	Aircraft Paint Shop	77	SF	0	7,711	0	7,711	218	0	218	218
					77							224

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

(See note at top of following page.)

Preliminary design is 100 percent complete by architect-engineer contractor Louis Graham and Associates, Berkeley, Calif.; design cost, $10,000.

Why cannot the aircraft painting at this location and, for that matter, the entire aircraft maintenance work here, be done at other locations or by private industry? Have you looked into that aspect of it?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir, it has been looked into. As our backup sheets show, Mr. Chairman, certain of the painting is now done by contract, but the question of transferring the aircraft and moving it about from one place to another through the town or around the town results in the extra expense which led to the conclusion if they had this shop and could keep it in an assembly-line operation, they could make sizable economies.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget approved the construction of these facilities?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir, this has been approved.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget approved this item for a paint shop and the consequent transfer of work from private industry into Government facilities under the Bureau of the Budget Circular 60–2?

General SEEMAN. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right. How long do you figure it will take to amortize this cost? Has any projection been made on that?

General SEEMAN. The savings on painting an average of 63 aircraft per year are estimated at $40,000. On a straight line this would be something like 5 years, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on this item?

Mr. JONAS. I see in order to arrive at this differential you include $281 for transportation.

General SEEMAN. That is correct.

Mr. JONAS. Do they fly these planes?

General SEEMAN. After repairs and/or modification in the Army facility they have to be transferred or flown from Sharpe Depot to an airfield in the vicinity of the painting contractor's plant. It is then towed or hauled to the work area and back to the airfield after painting. From there it is normally flown to the user or back to Sharpe to await assignment.

Mr. JONAS. Where would the commercial paint shop be located? How far do you transport the planes?

General SEEMAN. I do not have a distance in here, sir. We will have to provide that for the record.

Mr. JONAS. $281 per plane sounds pretty high. That is the reason I asked.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

(Information requested follows:)

Painting contractors serving Sharpe General Depot are located at Thermal, Calif., and Van Nuys, Calif., 400 and 350 air miles distant, respectively.

(See note at top of following page.)

CHEMICAL CORPS

Installation summary

[In thousands]

	Prior authorization	Proposed authorization	Proposed funding
Chemical	0	$1,264	$1,264
Army Chemical Center, Md	0	843	843
Fort Detrick, Md	0	334	334
Dugway Proving Ground, Utah	0	87	87

ARMY CHEMICAL CENTER, MD.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item, under Chemical Corps, is the Army Chemical Center.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Army Chemical Center	Maryland	Permanent	Md-2
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Baltimore, 15 miles SW	Harford and Baltimore	Chemical	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Research and Development - Chemical Agents and Munitions		1918	Active

II - MISSION

Research and development in the fields of chemical and radiological warfare, radiological defense, the conduct of medical research, and manufacture of chemical warfare material and protective devices. Non-Chemical Corps activities include Ordnance Assembly Plant, Army Environmental Health Labs of the Surgeon General, 2 AAA Bns, and 1 AAA Group Headquarters.

* One time cost for easement.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	357	1637	3712		5706
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	372	1434	4537		6343

IV - INVENTORY

	LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1.	OWNED	4553	$ 625,059	$ 55,746,301	$ 56,371,360
2.	LEASED	144	($ 72,321*)		$ 72,321
3.	INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959			(Except Land Rent)	$ 56,443,681
4.	AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 2,419,000
5.	AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 843,000
6.	ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 21,271,000
7.	GRAND TOTAL				$ 80,976,681

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)				
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30Jun59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m	
131	63	Post Signal Building	83	SF	0	16,560	0	16,560	430	0	430	430	263
740	57	Chapel (450 Seats) w/REF	85	SF	0	13,520	0	13,520	413	0	413	413	262
										TOTAL	843	843	

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

82

Designs have not been started. Design cost estimated at $21,000 for signal building; $17,000 for chapel.

What are you using for post signal building at this installation at the present time, and what consideration have you given to the use of existing facilities here?

General SEEMAN. This request, sir, is the result of the same type of training that we mentioned before. This new building is to consolidate telephone, teletype, and crypto facilities and to meet their necessary current and expanded requirements. The present switchboard is overloaded and is located in a hazardous area. It is housed in a toxic warehouse and plants area 40 feet from a white phosphorus production plant.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What will be done with the space which will be vacated if the new building is constructed?

General SEEMAN. It will revert to warehousing of reconditioned fire bombs which are now in open storage.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on that item, gentlemen?

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, you did not mention the chapel.

General SEEMAN. There is a chapel at the Chemical Center, also, page 85.

Mr. JONAS. You had no questions on that?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have no questions on that.

Mr. JONAS. What are you using for a chapel now?

General SEEMAN. They are using a semipermanent type, 250-seat chapel, but they have an average Sunday attendance of 650. They are holding Protestant services, 3 Catholic masses, and one of the masses is being conducted in the post theater. There are no existing religious educational facilities, and their average Sunday School attendance is 300. This is the basis of the request for this chapel.

Mr. JONAS. That is all.

FT. DETRICK, MD.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is Ft. Detrick, Md.

DATE 1 Mar 1960
DEPARTMENT ARMY
FISCAL YEAR 1961
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM | FISCAL YEAR: 1961 | DEPARTMENT: ARMY | DATE: 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Fort Detrick	Maryland	Permanent	Md-5
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Frederick (adjoining)	Frederick	Chemical	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Research and Development		1940	Active

II - MISSION

Research and development in all phases of biological warfare.

* One time cost for easement

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	92	363	1858		2313
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	134	556	2484		3174

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	1,214	$ 722,953	$ 66,980,979	$ 67,703,932
2. LEASED	16	($ 8,588)		$ 8,588
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959			(Except Land Rent)	$ 67,712,520
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 2,651,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 334,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 31,336,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 102,033,520

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30June59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30June59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30June59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
310	147	Biomathematical Science Bldg	87	SF	0	9,450	0	9,450	334	0	334	334
					86							

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Preliminary design is 90 percent complete by A. & E. contractor, George M. Ewing Co., Washington, D.C.; design cost, $17,000.

What considerations has been given to the use of available standby space at Fort Ritchie for this installation?

General SEEMAN. Fort Ritchie is in the same general area of Maryland. However, its facilities are for very special emergency nature, of headquarters type, not suited to research and development which is the Fort Detrick function.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much of the workload on the computer here is directly related to the Detrick activities and how much to other Army activities?

General SEEMAN. As I understand this requirement at Fort Detrick, it is specialized for the research and development work of the Chemical Corps. Of course, the Chemical Corps Command area is at Edgewood Arsenal, in that vicinity, and they are all coordinated through that. It is a coordinated operation. Actually, a function of the Chief of Chemical Corps Command Section in Washington operates out of Edgewood.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, the whole situation has been surveyed, both as to usability of what you have at Ritchie and also the regulation requirements though these channels, and obviously you figure you will have to have this as additional to your Edgewood function. Is that correct?

General SEEMAN. That is correct.

DUGWAY PROVING GROUND, UTAH

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, appearing on page 89.

DATE 1 Mar 1960
DEPARTMENT ARMY
FISCAL YEAR 1961
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Dugway Proving Ground	Utah	Permanent	Utah-7
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Salt Lake City, 86 miles NE	Tooele	Chemical	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Research and Development		1942	Active

II - MISSION

Large scale field testing and evaluation of items developed by Chemical Corps in the field of chemical, biological and radiological warfare; research and development in micrometeorology for the United States Army.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 Jun 1959	103	790	736		1629
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	103	865	1089		2057

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	466,126	$ 124,878	$ 43,730,921	$ 43,855,799
2. LEASED	8,561	($ 66)		$ 0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959 (Except Land Rent)				$ 43,855,799
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 1,300,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 87,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 11,476,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 56,718,799

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30June59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30June1959 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
740	181	Addition to NCO Open Mess	90	SF	3,256	3,050	0	3,050	87	0	87	87

89

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Preliminary design for this item is 100 percent complete by A. & E. contractor Ashton, Evans & Brazier, Salt Lake City, Utah; design cost, $5,000.

Under existing Army regulations, what size of noncommissioned officers open mess is called for at this location?

General SEEMAN. I shall have to check and provide that for the record. This 3,050-square-foot addition is within the Army regulation allowances for a station of this size, but what the total station is allowed, I do not have at hand.

Mr. NORWOOD. 6,306 total permanent requirements.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are you absolutely sure this is within the regulation?

General SEEMAN. "Absolutely" is a tremendous word, sir. I shall have to check it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget approved this?

General SEEMAN. We do request from time to time, as the situation demands, exception to criteria by the Department of Defense. Where we have an isolated station such as Dugway or an unusual demand, they have been receptive to considering that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would place in the record the status of that request and whether you do or do not have to obtain DOD clearance, and if you do not, how soon you can get it.

(The information requested follows:)

Army Regulation 415–31, Basic Housing and Space Allocations at Permanent Installations, prescribes allowances for noncommissioned officers open mess facilities. The allowance for a station having an NCO strength of 251 to 400 is 6,500 square feet. The present club membership includes 280 noncommissioned officers plus 74 civilian Army employees who, because they reside either on the post or adjacent to it, and are of a civilian grade equivalent to the top three grades of noncommissioned officers, have been authorized membership in the club. The addition to the existing noncommissioned officers open mess which is proposed in the new project will provide a total facility of 6,306 square feet, well within the allowance authorized. DOD has approved this item.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 30, 1960.

SIGNAL CORPS

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall resume hearings and take first the Signal Corps.

Please insert page 92 of the justifications in the record at this point.

(The page follows:)

[In thousands of dollars]

	Prior authorization	Proposed authorization	Proposed funding
Signal	0	9,218	9,218
Fort Huachuca, Ariz	0	415	415
Fort Monmouth, N.J	0	8,803	8,803

FORT HUACHUCA, ARIZ.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The first project is Fort Huachuca.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Fort Huachuca	Arizona	Permanent	Ariz-1
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Bisbee, 43 miles SE	Cochise	Chief Signal Officer	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
U. S. Army Electronic Proving Ground		1881	Active

II - MISSION

Provides field of electronic warfare, battlefield surveillance, Army aviation, meteorology and related activities; performs necessary technical and engineering tests and evaluation of communication and electronic systems and equipment; conducts operational research experiments and field tests; formulates doctrine, techniques and new concepts of Signal organizational elements required; and provides specialized individual and unit training.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	671	5611	1864		8146
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	863	5781	1372		8016

IV - INVENTORY

	LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED		73,377	$ 0	$ 49,424,261	$ 49,424,261
2. LEASED		1,079	($ 2146)		$ 0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959 (Except Land Rent)					$ 49,424,261
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY					$ 19,689,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST					$ 415,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION					$ 46,612,000
7. GRAND TOTAL					$ 116,140,261

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)				
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATIONS OUTSTANDG. 30June59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATIONS OUTSTANDG. 30June59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m	
310	84	2 Environmental Test Buildings	94	SF	0	8,000	0	8,000	204	0	204	204	81
310	85	Test Chamber Building	96	SF	0	1,571	0	1,571	127	0	127	127	204
841	83	Expansion of Water Distribution System	99	MGD	3.22	0.72	0	0.72	84	0	84	84	44
711	845.300	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	100	FAM	1,387	759	200	100	-	-	-	-	
										TOTAL	415	415	
					93								

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

77

(See note at top of following page.)

Preliminary design for the two environmental test buildings and the test chamber building is 95 percent complete; estimated cost of design $14,000 for the environmental building and $6,000 for the test chamber building. Design for these two is by Benner and Arnold of Phoenix, Ariz.

Final design of the expansion of the water distribution system is 100 percent complete. This design is by the district engineer, Los Angeles, at a cost of $4,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What has been your experience in the 1960 construction program at this location with specific reference to costs and the action taken by the Congress last year?

General SEEMAN. Mr. Norwood, have you a statement on the contracting information?

Mr. NORWOOD. For Fort Huachuca in the 1960 program we have awarded some of the items which were approved by this committee last year. Of the approximately 15 items in the program, five are under contract, one of them partially. The bid experience has been good. We have gone over the estimate we presented to the committee in two instances and are under in the balance. We cannot tell, of course, what is going to happen on the others, but the rest of them are all scheduled for award in the next few months, most of them before the month of May.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You say you have had a good experience with the contracts you have issued so far.

Mr. NORWOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. To what do you attribute that success?

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Chairman, that is something it is impossible for me to say here without an analysis of each contract and each award, but it is a situation which develops in the area depending on whether the contractors are really anxious to get to work or not, and not so much on the status of plans. They assume at the time they bid that these plans are final because we have finalized them. So in some of our estimates we have missed picking the price that the bidder bids. As you know, there can be a wide spread between what the bidder will bid and what the Government estimates in its estimate.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Of course there is division and latitude there. I grant you that. Has it not been indicated that where you have your plans finalized and know what you want in competitive bid operations, you have a better contracting procedure than you have when you must go into a lot of change orders because of lack of ability to finalize your plans when they go on a competitive bid basis? Is that a correct or incorrect assumption?

Mr. NORWOOD. It is correct, Mr. Chairman, that if it is known that the facility is not completely designed, the contractor will include in his bid a contingency for changes, for the unknowns. He can analyze the plans and specifications just as well as we as engineers, and if in his determination those documents describe a complete facility, he can come up with what he thinks are accurate costs. The question of how much he wants in the way of profit above costs is something none of us can anticipate.

General SEEMAN. Mr. Chairman, the fact that there is a little bigger program there encourages people to move into the area on a contractor basis. You may get a little more competition and more bidders.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes, that is true. I do not want to belabor the issue, but we go right back to the basic thing which is clearly evident when we are out in the field. Where you have finalized plans so a contractor can actually bid on what is needed and it is spelled out in the contract, definitized and understandable, then you walk away from change orders, a lot of headaches, and many readjustments which cost a lot of money.

General SEEMAN. If you can just hold them off until you get good foundation borings and good subsurface data, it is money in the bank.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It goes back to the A. & E. people. They are not in competitive status. If the military falls on its face by improper planning, it is because it picked improper people to do the planning for them. There is no evasion of that issue. That is just it. You run down these contracts where the squawks and the heat are on, and one thing is self-evident: Either the A. & E. people were not provided with the criteria necessary to draw a finalized plan and your contractor comes in and does a hypothetical bid to protect himself, or the contractor buys a contract because he can get amendments to the contract or change orders to bail him out, one or the other. That is very clearly indicated across the country. There is no question about it.

What portion of the buildings are related to the proposed contract for electronics environmental testing and proving at this location?

General SEEMAN. We have two environmental test buildings as the first item in this year's request, Mr. Chairman. If I might digress a few minutes, the word "environment" is a misnomer to a certain extent, because people think of climate. Actually, this environment is an electronic environment. Our problem is the fact that there are just thousands of radio and radar instruments in the modern battlefield. The Huachuca site was picked first as the last relatively interference-free area to conduct this research and development mission. When you consider the fact that the atomic battlefield will have small units dispersed over a wide area, communications and command are vital. This is what we are trying to reproduce in the Huachuca area. It is not only our equipment, but the fact that on the modern battlefield there will also be enemy electronic equipment. I know we have a problem where every individual or every squad would like to have a walkie-talkie and we fight that out, too, because that would kill us in procurement. Nevertheless, in the research and development field this is what we are up against. They are trying to reproduce at Huachuca an area which will correspond to an Army corps with representation of all the radios and other things which would be there, to see that we develop the best type of instrumentation for the future. That is what is so difficult for us to present.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I assume from the fact that you have made the selection upon that premise that it is still contemplated you may have developments unforeseen at the moment which could create interference like any other geographical area.

General SEEMAN. That is right, sir. Part of this is an area from Huachuca to the Yuma test station, because involved in addition to the ground troops electronic radio problems are the area surveillance and battlefield surveillance where you need to find out the targets for the newer weapons which are of longer range. This, too, is part of the

electronic environment that we are trying to create so we will have the best possible background for our eventual procurement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have selected it, and I can assume you have done it upon the premise of your requirement for isolation from interference to the degree possible. I can only assume that because I think we had previous testimony on the issue. What is the present status of that contract, gentlemen?

General SEEMAN. Have you the status of the A. & E. contract on the two environmental test buildings?

Mr. NORWOOD. Yes, sir. The preliminary plans are 95 percent complete by the architect-engineer firm of Brenner & Arnold of Phoenix, Ariz. The estimated cost of this design is $14,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for the so-called nerve center for the 79 mobile units in support and service in this location at the present time?

General MONAHAN. The test has not been started yet, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then at the moment the answer to that is none——

General MONAHAN. Right, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. As of the moment.

General MONAHAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What work is contemplated for the test chamber building that cannot be done in existing governmental facilities or private industry or institutions of that general character?

General SEEMAN. This is the second item, Mr. Chairman, at an estimated cost of $127,000. It is true, sir, that we have a test chamber building at Monmouth. This is a requirement at Huachuca to avoid the expense of shipping small items back and forth to another area or to a commercial area or to avoid the cost of flying them up in the air to the actual pressure and temperature conditions at which they have to be tested.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The equipment of this type which you receive at this location generally comes from contractor, Navy, and Air Force, judging from your justifications. What testing do they give this equipment before it reaches you and where you have to do the testing?

General MONAHAN. Usually the equipment has not been tested in the tropical or arctic environment or subjected to the humidity and altitude conditions which we want to simulate in these particular buildings. They are off-the-line pieces of equipment to which we want to give the additional climatic tests.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, in accordance with your response to my question, you are testing what has not been tested operationally under the conditions with which you will be confronted and in which the devices will have to operate. Is that correct?

General MONAHAN. That is correct.

FORT MONMOUTH, N.J.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is Fort Monmouth.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Fort Monmouth	New Jersey	Permanent	NJ-601-602-603-604-607
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Red Bank, 3 miles N	Monmouth	Chief Signal Officer	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Research and Development and Signal Training		1917	Active

II - MISSION

Train and prepare individual officers and enlisted men for assignment as specialists to Signal Corps Units throughout the world; design, develop and improve communications, meteorological, photographic and related ground and air signal equipment for the Army and standardize certain component parts of the equipment; train officers and enlisted men as specialists in electronic and related subjects.

*Includes $270 one time cost for easement

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 Jun 59	767	5372	7072		13,211
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	1712	6674	8056		16,442

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	1494	$ 563,517	$ 61,977,590	$ 62,541,107
2. LEASED	421	($ 72,307*)		$ 270
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 Jun 59			(Except Land Rent)	$ 62,541,377
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 99,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 8,803,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 69,632,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 141,075,377

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30 Jun59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
310	39	Signal R&D Lab (Final Incr)	102	SF	823,804	290,864	0	290,864	7,171	0	7,171	7,171 43
310	71	Climatic Test Chamber (R&D)	104	SF	0	6,250	0	6,250	550	0	550	550 174
724	37	BOQ (Female)	106	Off	0	40	0	40	361	0	361	361 112
740	58	Chapel (600-seat) w/REF	108	SF	0	30,130	0	22,505	960	0	721	721 205
										TOTAL	8,803	8,803

101

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

(See note at top of following page.)

Preliminary design of the signal R. & D. laboratory (final increment) is 100 percent complete. This design is by the Bollinger Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; estimated design cost, $325,000.

Design has not been started on climatic test chamber R. & D. Design will be by Gruenwald Associates, Long Island City, N.Y., at an estimated cost of $28,000.

Preliminary design of the bachelor officer quarters (female) is 10 percent complete. Design is by Milton L. Schengarten, Elizabeth, N.J.; estimated cost of design $14,000.

Final design of the chapel center is 100 percent complete. Design is by Fellheimer & Wagner, New York, N.Y., at cost of $30,000.

UTILIZATION OF PROPOSED INCREMENT OF MAIN LABORATORY

What are you using for laboratory facilities at the present time, and what will you do with these facilities if this final increment in the R. & D. laboratory is constructed?

General SEEMAN. Sir, this is quite an involved major adjustment at the Signal Corps laboratory. If this final increment of the main laboratory is built, there will be a readjustment among several of the areas at Monmouth.

As you know, there has been a tremendous increase in the research and development program of the Signal Corps. They do work for other services and also NASA, as I understand it. In fiscal 1951 their research and development program totaled $62 million. It has gone up steadily since that year until in 1959 their research program is $210 million with—I am not sure whether this is included or whether it is in addition—$20 million for ARPA and NASA.

General MONAHAN. That is included in the $210 million; yes, sir.

General SEEMAN. There are several areas in the Monmouth area, and our justification speaks of the Coles area and the Evans area. If this additional increment is approved and built, there will be an overall reduction of space used for this research and development mission. It will be reduced from 1,411,000 square feet to 1,346,000 square feet. There will be a disposal of 40 acres in the so-called Coles area and a disposal of 140,000 square feet of temporary frame buildings in that area. That will be overcome largely by the permanent space in the building, which will give the Signal Corps a much more efficient operation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are you using those temporary buildings for the present laboratory facilities?

General SEEMAN. They are being used now.

In addition, in the Coles area all temporary shelters and shed-type buildings will be completely torn down, as I understand it, and 209,000 square feet of this temporary space will be disposed of. There will be a savings in the cost of maintaining the 65,000 net reduction as well as the disposal of these 40 acres in the Coles area.

QUESTION AS TO IMPORTANCE OF CONTIGUOUS SPACE TO TIMING IN R. & D. PROGRAMS

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would specifically explain for the benefit of the committee the statement in your justification which says:

Failure to provide adequate R. & D. contiguous space at Fort Monmouth has retarded the R. & D. effort in the satellite, missile, nucleonics, and other communications-electronics fields by 3 years.

General SEEMAN. Mr. Chairman, your quote is citing page 103 in our justification book, General Monahan will respond to that question.

General MONAHAN. Mr. Chairman, there are many engineers, technicians and shop personnel involved in a single research and development project. For example, you have the tube technicians, the parts people, power source and antenna specialists, and it is necessary that the efforts of these individuals be coordinated and that there be free exchange of information between them.

As you know, the R. & D. facilities at Fort Monmouth are in two locations now. This limits the coordination and exchange of information on those projects which are classified. The telephone cannot be used for those.

We have made an extended study of this problem, and the study concludes that a considerable R. & D. time can be saved by the consolidation of these people into one location. In other words, get them together in order to have speedy coordination and an exchange of information.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In checking these statements O.S. & D. and USARDL officials advised our staff these latter two conclusions are in error. It was pointed out that to permit scientists and engineers to work in contiguous space as a team would provide for greater efficiency and feedback of information, thus reducing the development cycle.

They did not use the comparative conclusion you are reaching here, from 3 to 5 years.

General SEEMAN. I can appreciate, Mr. Chairman, where there would be a difference in judgment among experts on this thing. We were very critical of this. The chief signal officer, General Nelson, got into it personally and made a very exhaustive analysis. It is true that you cannot definitely say that 2 hours will be saved here, or 2 days or 2 years. There is no question that under the one roof, efficiency of operations will be facilitated. I would not question at all the analysis of another expert as to just how much it would be facilitated. Whether you can save 5 years or 3 years in the development cycle is just a question that you might have disagreements on. Certainly where you have a long cycle now in this age where things occur very rapidly, within reason where you can shorten the cycle and improve the working conditions and the efficiency, this has been our approach to the problem, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When this record comes down, I wish you would be as specific as you can in view of the comments which I have discussed with you.

General SEEMAN. I would like to make the study available to the committee. It is rather large, probably too large for the record, and it may be classified.

General MONAHAN. No; I have a copy of that study here.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why do you not pick pertinent points out of your study to verify your position as indicated in your justification, as against what I have quoted.

General SEEMAN. I shall be happy to.

Mr. SHEPPARD. To put the whole study in the record of course would be impossible.

General SEEMAN. It is quite voluminous and detailed.

(The information requested follows:)

The two referenced statements (last two sentences "* * * Failure to * * * is completed." page 103, military construction program item justification data,

fiscal year 1961, appropriation dated March 1, 1960) are in error and should be deleted. The following statements should be inserted in lieu of the two to be deleted:

"Failure to provide adequate R. & D. contiguous space at Fort Monmouth has retarded the R. & D. effort in the satellite, missile, and other space projects. The present 9 to 12 years' development cycle will be drastically reduced if this building is completed. The magnitude of the reduction supported by a 1958 Signal Corps study would be in the order of 3 years."

The study estimates potential savings in the following listed areas:

(*a*) Research, 4 months.
(*b*) Contract administration, 3 months.
(*c*) Feasibility study, 3.5 months.
(*d*) Engineering design (ED), 11 months.
(*e*) Component designed (conducted during ED–ET time frame).
(*f*) Engineering test (ET), 4 months.
(*g*) Systems demonstration, 2 months.
(*h*) User test, 3 months.
(*i*) Type classification, 1 month.
(*j*) Equipment production, 6 months.
Total, 3 years plus.

These savings would result from improved management communications and administration which may be expected when widely separated activities such as the Evans and R. & D. facilities at Fort Monmouth, which are operationally, administratively, and managerially dependent on each other are consolidated in one location with their laboratory facilities. The addition of the third increment would permit scientific and engineer personnel of both the Evans and Hexagon staff to avail themselves of modern laboratory facilities which are essential for the predicision conditions required to cope with the increases in the art of space technology. These modern facilities are necessary to conduct in-house testing and evaluation of equipment submitted by contractors for acceptance, and to conduct minimum essential in-house basic and applied research. Also the Evans staff would have immediate access to the USASRDL computer facilities in the Hexagon.

No direct comparison may be made between satellite programs prior to and after completion of the Hexagon but the estimate of savings on a 9-year basis given above is believed a valid comparison for the comment on retardation of the satellite program.

ECONOMY OF INHOUSE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. SHEPPARD. What do you do in the laboratories at Monmouth which cannot be accomplished at other Government facilities or private industry or institutions?

General MONAHAN. We have been conducting regular inhouse research and development in communications and electronics for quite same time. There are some areas of military interest which we find cheaper and to the Army's advantage to do inhouse. One example is security equipment. It takes special cleared people and classified areas to conduct this. We do considerable contracting with industry and other laboratories in addition to what we do at Fort Monmouth.

Mr. SHEPPARD. My further comments are not predicated on my personal thinking, but the present administration has clearly indicated, both by OSD and other divisions of the military, that wherever they can they want private business to carry the responsibility for many of these functions. My basic question I would ask is whether or not other availabilities have been surveyed from both the economic and operational point of view in order to justify this presentation. While I know you have followed the pattern you just described, I go back to the question and ask you if surveys have been made of other Government facilities and private industry or institutions.

General SEEMAN. Generally, Mr. Chairman, where you have facilities you compare the availability of your own facilities and what

would be the cost outside, and you try to establish the most economical way of proceeding, time being considered.

The big problem in the military research and development is that so much of the work is on items which are unique to the military in this particular area. Certainly the long-range communications of U.S. industry are probably as good as any in the world. Nevertheless, there are still immense radar and specific communications requirements which are peculiar to the military, aside from the question which General Monahan brings up to the classification of the work.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Gentlemen, have they been surveyed on a comparable cost-factor basis and the availability of services required? Have they actually been surveyed, or is this an assumption?

General SEEMAN. They have actually been surveyed. Before they go into a large research and development project, all of these alternate methods of producing the end result must be discussed and presented to the Assistant Secretary of the Army, who surveys them particularly with a view to the application of this new circular of the Bureau of the Budget on commercial and industrial facilities, to make the maximum use of those, all other things being considered.

PLANNED MOVE OF PERSONNEL IN THE COLES AND EVANS AREAS

Mr. SHEPPARD. If this third increment is constructed, you plan, as I understand it, to move personnel from the Evans area into the third increment, and move the functions now in the so-called Coles area to the Evans area. I also understand that it is quite essential that those personnel employed in SESA at the Coles area be as close to the research and development laboratory as possible due to collaboration requirements. By moving them from the Coles to the Evans area, what is the change in the relative distances?

General MONAHAN. The Coles area is some 4 miles from the main laboratory building, and Evans is some 12 miles from the main lab building, but in this move we bring the engineers and technicians from Evans in to the Hexagon, where they will be all together. We are keeping Evans because there are some permanent buildings at Evans where there are not permanent buildings at Coles.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is to happen to those employed in the SESA operation, for example?

General MONAHAN. They will be moved to Evans, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does that not take them further away from the laboratory than they would have been in the persent position?

General SEEMAN. As I understand it, General Monahan, the need for a certain portion of that Evans area is for a far end operation of certain testing facilities, and while they are classed as permanent buildings, they are not permanent buildings of the class of this main research and development building. They will be retained there to provide a certain function in the R. & D. program which requires them to be at a little bit of distance.

General MONAHAN. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the driving time, for example, between the Evans area and the proposed third increment which we are discussing here?

General MONAHAN. Between Evans and the post? It is some 12 miles, usually 30 minutes. It is through a builtup area.

PROPORTION OF INHOUSE WORK AT LABORATORY

Mr. SHEPPARD. What has been the record of the inhouse work at this laboratory for the past 4 or 5 years, and what do you expect in the future?

General SEEMAN. I might go back, Mr. Chairman, to my statement of the R. & D. program of the Signal Corps. It started with $62 million in 1951, and in 1959, 8 years later, it is $210 million. There has been a progressive increase over the years, steadily.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the actual record on the inhouse work at the laboratory?

General SEEMAN. General Monahan, do you have the proportion of the program which is done inhouse versus contract?

General MONAHAN. I do not have those figures. We will provide that.

(The information requested follows:)

The inhouse work at the laboratory for the last 4 years has been approximately 7 percent of the total R. & D. and PEMA funds combined which supported research and development. This percentage figure does not include costs of engineering acceptance tests made on submissions from contracts, technical direction of contracts, or preparation of technical plans for contracts. It is anticipated that this level of inhouse effort will remain relatively constant for the foreseeable future as we anticipate little change in personnel strength.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is your estimate of savings here based upon the completion of this third increment?

General SEEMAN. We do not have a specific estimate of savings. I have estimated in round numbers, with the reduction of the 65,000 square feet and a difference between maintenance of a temporary building versus permanent buildings of 10 cents a square foot, probably there will be a savings of $6,000 or $7,000 in the O. & M. costs. Actually, the savings in time due to the shortening of the development program is very difficult to evaluate.

UNSUITABLE SPACE IN THE EVANS AND COLES AREAS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Can you point out specifically for the benefit of the record the space in the Evans area which is unsuitable for work being carried out there now?

General SEEMAN. In the Evans area approximately 209,000 square feet will be torn down. In the Coles area 140,000 square feet of temporary buildings will be torn down as well as the 40 acres of land which will be excessed. The total amount of temporary buildings to be disposed of will be 349,000 square feet. That compares to the 290,-864 square feet requested in this final increment of the building.

CURRENT PERSONNEL AS COMPARED WITH NUMBER PROJECTED FROM 1952

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the employment at USARDL at the present time and how does that compare with the projected employment made in 1952 when the building was planned?

General MONAHAN. I have the present figures. I do not have the 1952 figures. I will provide those for you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right. Give us the present figures and then provide the others.

General MONAHAN. The present figures are roughly 2,000 at the hexagon or the main laboratory building, and 1,000 in the Evans buildings—roughly 3,000 people.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You may supply the remaining figures for the record, please.

General MONAHAN. Yes, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

In 1952 the plan was based on a projected employment of 4,500. This figure included approximately 1,000 personnel within the R. & D. facilities who were organized in fiscal year 1956 into the U.S. Army Signal equipment support agency now located at Coles. If the third increment is completed there will still be approximately 4,500 persons accommodated in the Evans and R. & D. facilities at Fort Monmouth together.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have made some issue with reference to the construction of this building as to the inconvenience of the long walking distance from one side of the building to the other and up and down the various steps. What provisions are you making at the present time to build elevators in the present structure, regardless of whether the third increment is completed?

General SEEMAN. Is there any plan?

General MONAHAN. No.

General SEEMAN. There is no plan to put elevators in except as part of the construction of the new building.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think perhaps you had better check your answer over pretty carefully, because there seems to be a difference of concept between what has been presented and what we have found.

General SEEMAN. I cannot put my finger on it, Mr. Chairman, but I do recall some statement about an elevator shaft which had been put in previously in preparation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Look at that question when the record comes down and provide your answer.

(The information requested follows:)

A proposal to build additional elevators in the present laboratory building at Fort Monmouth was submitted to the office of the chief signal officer. In anticipation of early completion of the third increment, this proposal did not receive favorable consideration as the additional elevators included in the third increment will be adequate to serve these laboratory facilities.

REDUCTION IN ESTIMATED COST OF PROJECT

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it not true that the estimate originally presented to the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget in support of this project was considerably higher than the one presently before us, and quite a number of errors in size, cost, and so forth, contained therein were found by the investigating staff of the committee working with people in the local area and, as a result thereof, we have an estimate which is about $800,000 less than originally contemplated?

General SEEMAN. Mr. Chairman, when we were putting this program together, when it started a year ago, our estimate for the final increment was over $7,900,000. It is true our estimate at this time is $7,171,000. Whether or not this is due to refinements in plans or closer estimating as we proceeded, or errors, as they do creep in on a building of this magnitude, I just do not know. There are several occasions as we go through making up our program where more complete estimates come in and we try to provide the best and latest for you; $800,000 would be over 10 percent. We certainly ought to be able to estimate closer than that when we come up to your committee.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any further questions on the request we have just discussed? The gentleman on my right.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I feel that I must raise here this question.

This represents again, does it not, the third increment, which means this is a plan that you formulated some years ago as a part of the overall policy of determining what you eventually want to have in the way of military quarters and facilities.

I have not heard any testimony so far in response to the questions of the chairman which indicates that you are unable to do your job as presently situated.

When the record before our committee shows that building costs are going up 4½ to 7 percent a year because of the overspending by the Government leading to inflation, when I read that our President is going to the summit conference and attempt to work out some basis for the two world divisions to scale down the military, I wonder what damage would be done if this construction were postponed in the hopes that somewhere along the line the military would quit being a part of our overall operations forever? In other words, I would like to know what would happen if this were postponed. You have had so much surplus in times past. What effect would it have on your meeting your job for the next 2 or 3 years?

Our investigating staff says the present buildings are meeting the job fully. It was said in the justifications before this committee and the Congress for the first two increments that the third was not to be built until the buildings you are now using deteriorated to the point that it would be better to build new ones.

Our investigators say that has not happened. I do not believe you say that it has happened. The pictures certainly do not indicate it.

Again, I would like you to tell me, if we postponed the third increment in the hopes that perhaps we may never have to build them, what harm would be done to the overall work?

General SEEMAN. Actually, we have postponed coming in and requesting the final increment over the last year or two somewhat toward the same hope. There is no question about it, we could continue to operate as we have in the present structures. Frame structures, such as they are, can be continued and maintained. The evaluation of improving the production of these research and development type people is difficult to prove in a specific monetary saving. The specific answer, sir, is that we could get along with what we have if somebody could say that in 2 or 3 years the requirements would vanish. There would be no question. If we could specifically say that these requirements would vanish or would go down, we would not be making this request.

Mr. WHITTEN. If anybody could say that. If, on the other hand, should we build because we do not know that it might not? Should we go ahead with a permanent establishment of this sort as long as there is hope and as long as present facilities are sufficient? The matter is really disturbing.

I have in my files a letter from private business to a military establishment to let the personnel buy at local stores, which are plentiful. The commanding officer says even though there are ample places there to buy groceries and other items in the community, the PX and commissary are the fringe benefits. I have been to officers clubs in Wash-

ington and all the major cities where you do not have the same tax and the same costs.

Before us here today, as I see it, is a third increment because the military has decided it wants everything just as it wants it, even though you can do the job as it needs to be done and are doing it in the present facilities.

When the military as a whole is spending 50 percent of the total national income, if we cannot put a little taxpayer interest in this, I do not know where we shall end. I mean that in all seriousness.

General SEEMAN. I certainly appreciate your viewpoint.

Mr. WHITTEN. What are you going to do with the Coles area? You say you are going to tear the buildings down. Why are you going to tear them down? Do you plan to continue to operate the Coles area?

General SEEMAN. No. The Coles area will be completely excessed and disposed of as part of the present plan.

Mr. WHITTEN. Will you tear the buildings down before you dispose of it?

General SEEMAN. This would be a determination of the real estate agency as to how they could gain the maximum benefit to the Treasury.

Mr. JONAS. Will you yield before you leave Coles?

Mr. WHITTEN. Could I ask one more question?

Could we have at this point the land and properties that have been declared surplus by the Army for the last 8 or 10 years—location, original investment, and return? I would like that later, if we could, with regard to each of the other two services.

General SEEMAN. That is rather and extensive list. We will provide it for the record.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am aware it is extensive.

(The information requested was not available in time for printing at this point in the Record and will be found in the appendix.)

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

MARKET VALUE OF PROPERTY TO BE DISPOSED OF

Mr. JONAS. Before you leave Coles, what do you estimate the market value of that 40 acres to be?

General SEEMAN. I have no estimate of that in that area of New Jersey. I would say it would depend upon how close it is to commercial areas. General Monahan, is this agricultural or commercial?

General MONAHAN. It is commercial area.

Mr. JONAS. How does it lie? Flat, rolling, rocky, hilly?

General MONAHAN. Rather flat. It has a small incline on one side, but it is relatively flat.

Mr. JONAS. What would you say its value would be?

General MONAHAN. I could give you only a guess.

Mr. JONAS. What is your guess? You are familiar with it.

General MONAHAN. I would say $2,000 to $3,000 an acre. That is a very rough guess.

Mr. JONAS. $100,000, probably

General SEEMAN. This will inure to the benefit of the Treasury. These receipts go into the Treasury.

Mr. JONAS. I understand.

Mr. WHITTEN. I just do not see how we on this committee can justify going ahead under present financial conditions as long as hope exists that this thing may work out. We are spending millions of dollars on an increment of some superplan which the military set up years ago in the hopes of having everything eventually just as they would like to have it. As long as buildings look as these appear in these pictures, as long as they are serviceable and you can do the fine job you are doing with these facilities, personally I feel all this type of construction should be postponed. If we are to do all this as long as we do not know that it is going to end, we may crack up before we should. Certainly we should not go ahead with this as long as we do not know. As long as there is any hope or any possibility, as long as the job can be done, speaking for myself I think this construction should be deferred.

General SEEMAN. There is one consideration, sir. As you know, we hope world tension will decline. Still, we have the feeling, which I think is generally expressed, that we must keep up on our research and development.

Mr. WHITTEN. You are talking about work. I am talking about spending money for permanent facilities. Those are two different things. I asked the question earlier, Where was the work being interfered with and if it could not be done under the present investment and present quarters? Your answer is that it can be, and I think that is the proper answer from the investigation we have made. As long as that is true, I think we might postpone this construction. I speak only as one member of the subcommittee.

General SEEMAN. Then, sir, I hope you will not necessarily make final judgment from the picture, on the superficial appearance of the buildings. The engineers have made an investigation for the staff which would be sufficiently definitive really to base a judgment on.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, if it has not been done, I would like the investigators' report to go into the record at this point, because they went into the buildings and checked them, and they did find them in excellent shape. So I am not forming my opinion from a cursory type of inspection by members of the investigating staff.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see no objection to that request, and it will be inserted in the record.

(The report referred to will be found on p. 672 of the appendix at the end of this volume.)

General SEEMAN. I know we have afforded the people maximum access and provided them all the help we could.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am talking about an overall problem. It is not directed to you. I do not want it to be taken that I am speaking only of an Army situation. I think the Army in many respects handles its business much better than one or two of the other services. I am just raising the overall situation, and I trust you will take it that way.

Mr. JONAS. Your support facilities are located in the Coles area; is that right?

General MONAHAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. Do you have any scientists working in the Coles area?

General MONAHAN. No, sir.

Mr. JONAS. Nothing except supporting facilities?

Mr. WESTENBERGER. This is an administration and logistics support area.

Mr. JONAS. They do no research?

Mr. WESTENBERGER. No, sir, not as such.

EFFECT OF SHIFTING PERSONNEL BETWEEN EVANS AND COLES AREAS

Mr. JONAS. You were a little inconsistent in one of your reasons for justifying this item. You said you wanted to get your people closer together. You will move this group 2½ miles from the laboratory to about 9 or 12 miles away. You certainly are not bringing them closer together if you move them 8 or 10 miles further away than they are at present.

Will you not have a serious problem, more of a problem, with your administrative and support activities located 9 miles away than to have some of your scientists down there?

General MONAHAN. No, sir. The type of administrative support is to provide literature for the equipment, running endurance tests on such things as batteries and power equipments. We feel that the presence of the engineers in the Hexagon is much more important and timesaving.

Mr. JONAS. I can understand why you would want them in the Hexagon, but speaking of the people who support this complex you are moving them way off into the periphery of the area and you will present a problem of administration, will you not?

General SEEMAN. I think we are talking about the word "support." They are not necessarily solely the support of this individual area.

Mr. JONAS. Support an entire complex.

General SEEMAN. No, sir; it supports the whole Army. It is more or less a pure logistics function after the R. & D. function has been complete.

It is true that their function would not be as well coordinated as that of the scientists in the pure R. & D. function, but it is a signal corps support of the entire Army in the logistics area and it is not timewise so important as the R. & D. function.

Is that correct? You did not mean this was new support?

General MONAHAN. No.

General SEEMAN. It is support of the entire Army in a little more relaxed time frame than the mission of the R. & D. where they expect to shorten development time.

Mr. JONAS. Have you read the staff report?

General SEEMAN. No, sir.

ADEQUACY OF PRESENT PERSONNEL SPACE

Mr. JONAS. The investigators indicated they could see no evidence of overcrowded conditions in existing space. What do you say about that, General Monahan? They seem to think you could move a lot of additional people there without building this third area, and that you had excess space not efficiently used.

General MONAHAN. I do not think that is the situation, sir.

Mr. JONAS. I recall one specific comment they made that you had a lot of heavy equipment with very few people assigned to use it,

and it was just housing heavy equipment and was not overcrowded from the standpoint of personnel.

General MONAHAN. Some of our laboratory facilities do have types of equipment which take up space, and not very many people are involved in its operation. The tests run over periods of time when the engineers will make periodic visits to the area.

Mr. JONAS. In nontechnical language can you tell us the difference between the activities at the Hexagon and at Evans?

General MONAHAN. There is no really technical difference between the two of them. We have our engineers and technicians split. It is a division of responsibility of the activities rather than any difference in the type of function.

Mr. JONAS. Really, then, the primary reason for wanting to move is just to get all of the activity under one roof; more convenience than anything else, is it not?

General MONAHAN. Convenience, to facilitate the coordination and working together of the people involved.

Mr. JONAS. When you complete this Hexagon how many miles will the circuit involve? You speak about being closer together. Frankly, I would rather ride an automobile 9 miles than walk all through that thing.

General SEEMAN. I do not mean to be facetious but we have a hard time getting automobiles, too, sir.

Mr. JONAS. My impression is that you have plenty of cars. I do not think you are suffering from lack of vehicles.

General SEEMAN. It is a problem in the operating field.

Mr. JONAS. How long does it take you to get from the Pentagon to the Navy Building?

General SEEMAN. Ten minutes during the free hours and probably a half hour during the rush hour. We run shuttle buses, as you know.

Mr. JONAS. Why could you not run one at Monmouth?

General SEEMAN. They probably do.

General MONAHAN. They do.

Mr. SHEPPARD. They have a bus operation there?

General MONAHAN. That is right, sir.

ESTIMATED REDUCED MAINTENANCE COSTS

Mr. JONAS. General Seeman, you speak in the justification about the savings which would be involved in reduced maintenance costs of these buildings at Evans. Do you have any records to show any extraordinary maintenance costs in recent years? My information is that you have not had anything there except just ordinary run of the mill work.

General SEEMAN. There has been no major rehabilitation of the Evans and Coles area. It has been routine.

The chairman brought this out in discussions previously—our O. & M. accounts do not break out O. & M. facilities separately from the overall operating expenses. It is true, too, that when you build new buildings in this modern day to give your people better working conditions you put in air conditioning because that is an efficient work tool, also.

Mr. JONAS. I agreed with much that was said by the gentleman from Mississippi and also by the chairman. We have to be satisfied that it is essential to spend this $7 million. That is the reason we are asking you these questions. We want to give you a chance to satisfy us if you can.

General SEEMAN. You also have access to information sometimes as to how disarmament and other talks are going. It is very difficult to reach a specific decision.

Mr. WHITTEN. The present financial plight is the thing I am concerned about. There is evidence that perhaps you did not anticipate our going along.

LONG-RANGE PLANNING FOR PARKING AREA AND SITE FOR THIRD INCREMENT

I have a quotation here from our staff investigation. The staff observed a temporary parking area located in this facility. This along with other site improvements were constructed from first increment funds. These improvements consisted of drainage, and so forth—and cost approximately $439,000.

If you felt this was an essential thing I ask why you spent $400,000 for the parking area when the third increment will destroy it?

I am always fearful you might want another site so it will fit the description "hexagon" as against a real need.

They say that years ago when they built the Department of Agriculture they got only two-thirds of what they requested so they built two wings, and in that way Congress would be forced to supply funds to build the portion in the middle to join it.

It seems to me you are here looking for the "hex" for the hexagon.

General SEEMAN. The reason that was put in there was because they did not anticipate that their R. & D. program would expand by 240 percent according to the figures I have cited, and they felt they would not need the additional expansion.

Time now has proven that decision unwise perhaps.

Mr. WHITTEN. It has proved it to you but not to me when you say you are doing a good job and you are continuing to do a good job with present facilities. You have not proven it to me.

Mr. WESTENBERGER. Might I make a comment, sir?

Mr. WHITTEN. Go right ahead.

Mr. WESTENBERGER. In the 1952 and 1953 legislation we had the first and second increments. The first increment was completed in November of 1954 and the second increment in June of 1955.

The record of 1952 and 1953 will indicate that the Army contemplated a third and final increment in the succeeding year. This was not possible of achievement.

Parking areas had been contemplated under the third increment. This not being possible it was necessary in 1957 to do two things—waterproof the existing increments and put parking areas in there.

Mr. WHITTEN. I can appreciate that, but if you were going to put this third increment into a building it is hard to figure why you put the parking area at a place where you later would have to destroy it when you built the third increment. It seems you did not anticipate getting it or it shows shortsightedness to put a parking area right where you know you will later have to tear it up.

How much will it cost to put in a parking area after you put a building on the present parking area?

Mr. WESTENBERGER. It is only partially on the area of the new site. The parking area that was substantially built in 1957 was a parking area that was going to be included in the third increment and it is not on the new site, so you will have parking area on the old and new sites, but essentially the amount of money you are referring to has to do with waterproofing the first increments and paving the parking area that is not on the site of the new building. There is some of that money on this new site, I will concede.

Mr. WHITTEN. I appreciate our conceding it but we are not in a contest. We are trying to find out the facts.

I ask this again: Was it faulty planning that caused you to put your original parking area where you now plan to put this building? Was it a change in attitude on your part, or did you put it there first because you thought you had better get the parking area out of the first increment? You might get it out of the third, you might not get the third, so you put it in the first?

The point I make is, Why was it put in this area where the building is contemplated?

Mr. WESTENBERGER. Our maps indicate the area that has been now substantially paved in 1957 was consistent with the plans that were presented to the committees of Congress in the fiscal years 1952 and 1953 programs.

Mr. WHITTEN. Did you realize that it would later be destroyed by putting a building on it?

Mr. WESTENBERGER. Where the building will be that may require destruction of pavement placed in 1957, I cannot answer.

General SEEMAN. The major portion of the $400,000-plus estimate that you have will not be destroyed.

Mr. JONAS. The information we have is that when this original justification was made in 1952 you planned for about 4,500 employees after the third increment was completed. Do you recall whether that is correct?

General MONAHAN. I cannot tell you at this time.

Mr. JONAS. Now you have about 3,500, and there is no plan to increase personnel.

General SEEMAN. That is correct.

Mr. JONAS. Would that not be some evidence in support of our feeling that perhaps there is not an absolute need?

General SEEMAN. It is possible, sir. I would have to compare it only with the scope of the Signal Corps R. & D. program. In 1952 it was $64 million and it is now $210 million. How much of that is personnel cost and how much is contract cost I do not know.

Mr. JONAS. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

ARMY SECURITY AGENCY

VINT HILL FARMS STATION, VA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Under the Army Security Agency we have Vint Hill Farms Station.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM
1 - INSTALLATION DATA
FISCAL YEAR 1963
DEPARTMENT ARMY
DATE 1 Mar 1960
4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
13 TYPE

53984—60—7

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Vint Hill Farms Station	Virginia	Permanent	Va-800
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Warrenton, 11 Miles W	Fauquier and Prince William	Army Security Agency	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Classified		1942	Active

II - MISSION

Classified mission of a permanent nature is assigned this installation

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	64	583	235		882
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	443	878	925		2246

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	721	$ 127,500	$ 7,410,887	$ 7,538,387
2. LEASED	3	($ 4,860)	0	$ 0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959			(Except Land Rent)	$ 7,538,387
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 323,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 0
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 21,783,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 29,644,387

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30June59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30June59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
		Prior Authorization										
		P.L. 84/161										
219	24	Post Engineer Composite Building	112	SF	0	14,300	14,300	0	323	323	0	281 323
					111							

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Final design for the post engineer composite building is 100 percent complete. This design is by Bernard L. Frishman Associates, Washington, D.C., at a cost of $17,000.

How many times has Congress either denied appropriations for this building or approved the funds and the Army has not constructed it?

General SEEMAN. I do not recall whether we have never requested funds before last year, Mr. Chairman. I know it was in our program last year and it was denied.

It is true it is a prior authorization item, and its present estimate is $323,000.

It is to provide buildings in an estimated amount of 14,300 square feet for more efficient operations and post-engineering work which now uses old stables and scattered woodframe buildings.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on this item?

Mr. WHITTEN. Were you given the overall figures for military construction at the Department of Defense level, and did you take that figure and work backwards as to what would be included, or did you go before the Defense Department to whomever is your superior in this area, and did they pass on each project on its merits? Which of those procedures did you follow, and if you followed neither which course did you follow?

General SEEMAN. Actually, sir, we followed both. In general the overall Defense budget is made up of a certain amount.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is the military construction budget?

General SEEMAN. No, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. I know it applies generally. Go ahead.

General SEEMAN. I talked specifically about the Army. Its Program Advisory Group and Budget Advisory Committee are under the Chief of Staff. They take in the general scope of the Army's budget. We have intramural fights among ourselves as to the proportion to be spent for R. & D., the PEMA appropriation, maintenance and military construction.

This year our military construction is around $209 million. That is 2 or 3 percent of the total Army budget.

At the same time this fight is going on we are preparing in the Construction Division our program of overall line items that have been requested.

This adds up to much more than we are finally able to get out of the Army budget, but nevertheless it is a process you have to go through to find out what your most important requirements are.

Timing being what it is, our construction line item list is in Defense at about the same time that they are discussing the overall segments of the budget, so we are both given a quota, if you want to use that term, from our own Army staff, and from higher levels, and also given an individual line item review by both the Comptroller in the Department of Defense and Mr. Bryant's properties and installations shop.

I may not have answered your question very well.

Mr. WHITTEN. I think that answers it. I notice this item is listed at a priority of about 281. You felt the budget was sufficiently large for the Defense Department to allow you an item with a classification number of 281, so apparently you came out pretty well with the funds.

General SEEMAN. Our item list was in the $300 to $340 million range. True we were fighting individual line items. At the same time we were fighting within our own house for a share of the Army budget.

This station is one of the hard-core stations. This is one of the things we use in our very important operations. We have had this before you previously, and if you should ask me the question, we could get along with our present facilities, but it is an inefficient operation.

Mr. WHITTEN. Is this part of an increment of an original plan to eventually get what you wanted?

General SEEMAN. This station has a master plan, as all of our stations do, sir, and this is the postengineer complex. They have a headquarters building there now, as I recall, and they have a thoroughly worked out plan. This is next in priority for their station.

Colonel EVANS. This was not fed into the program because there was extra leeway, but we deleted many items before we got to this 280 priority. We had 500 or 600 items which had to be pared down to this present total of about 300. It was not added because we had leeway.

Mr. WHITTEN. From the money that was allocated to you you were able to include this.

Colonel EVANS. We said we had this much money and——

Mr. WHITTEN. You thought this was more important than many other items?

Colonel EVANS. That is right.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

FORT BELVOIR, VA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Turning to Corps of Engineers, we shall take up Fort Belvoir, Va.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Fort Belvoir	Virginia	Permanent	Va-400 and nVa-401
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Alexandria, 11 miles NE	Fairfax, Va., and Fayette, West Va.	Engineers	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Engineer School, Research and Development, and Unit Training			

II - MISSION

Maintenance and operation of Engineer field maintenance and Engineer troop supply activities of the Engineer Center and Military District of Washington. Training of assigned or attached Engineer general reserve units and bulk allotment troops. Maintenance and operation of the Engineer Service Test Unit. To maintain and operate the Engineer Research & Development Laboratories for the purpose of research and development as directed by the Chief of Engineers. Provide administration and jurisdiction over all Army aviation operations, maintenance and supply for all aviation units and activities assigned, attached or stationed at Davison Army Airfield for aviation service for Department of Defense, Department of the Army and the Military District of Washington.

*Includes $4,262 one-time cost for easement.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	1317	9398	3811		14,526
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	2772	10453	4036		17,261

IV - INVENTORY

	LAND ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	9,263	$ 1,155,074	$ 81,910,327	$ 83,065,401
2. LEASED	367	($ 5,087*)		$ 4,262
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959 (Except Land Rent)				$ 83,069,663
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 4,293,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 1,838,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 88,726,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 177,926,863

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)				
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDS 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDS 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m	
111	259	Runway (RW) (DAAF)	117	SY	0	4,700	0	4,700	185	0	185	185	215
112	278	Taxiways and Runups (RW) (DAAF)	118	SY	1,200	8,800	0	8,800	182	0	182	182	216
113	279	Parking Apron (RW) (DAAF)	119	SY	18,900	15,200	0	15,200	200	0	200	200	218
121	275	Aircraft Fuel Storage (DAAF)	120	Gal	20,000	40,000	0	40,000	125	0	125	125	214
134	258	Remove or Mark Flight Obstructions (DAAF)	121	Dlr	0	LS	0	LS	62	0	62	62	212
136	260	Heliport Lighting (DAAF)	122	LF	0	3,060	0	3,060	100	0	100	100	217
921	281	Acquisition of Clearance Easement (DAAF)	123	Acr	132	145	0	145	30	0	30	30	213
					115								

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

98

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (Continued)

INSTALLATION NAME: Fort Belvoir — DATE: 1 Mar 1960

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (Continued)

INSTALLATION NAME: Fort Belvoir

DATE: 1 Mar 1960

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)				
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m	
131	264	Addition to Communications Building Nr 246	124	SF	7,022	4,500	0	4,500	145	0	145	145	109
831	220	Improvement Sewage Plant #2	125	MGD	2.0	1.5	0	1.5	809	0	809	809	110
										SUB-TOTAL	1,838	1,838	
		Prior Authorization											
		P.L. 86/149											
872	89	Security Fence & Perimeter Road (DAAF)	127	LF	0	18,000	18,000	0	159	159	0	159	279
111	249	Extension of Runway (DAAF)	128	SY	25,834	2,500	2,500	0	156	156	0	156	280
										SUB-TOTAL	0	315	
		P.L. 84/968											
171	257	Flight Training Building	130	SF	0	4,256	4,256	0	94	94	0	94	210
										TOTAL	1,838	2,247	

116

DA FORM 1674a-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

(See notes on following page.)

Preliminary design for the runway (RW), taxiway and runups, and the parking apron is 90 percent complete. This design is by Benj. E. Bearin Co., Baltimore, Md.; estimated cost of design is $9,000, $9,000, and $10,000, respectively.

Preliminary design for the aircraft fuel storage is 95 percent complete. This design is by Thos. B. Bourne Associates, Washington, D.C.; estimated cost of design is $6,000.

Preliminary design for item to remove or mark flight obstructions is 95 percent complete. This design is by the Washington District, Washington, D.C.; estimated cost of design is $3,000.

Preliminary design for heliport lighting is 90 percent complete. This design is by Benj. E. Bearin Co., Baltimore, Md.; estimated cost of design is $5,000.

No design is required for acquisition of clearance easements.

Final design for addition to communications building No. 246 is 85 percent complete. This design is by Lublin-McGaughy and Associates, Washington, D.C.; estimated cost of design is $7,000.

Preliminary design for improvement of sewage plant No. 2 is 100 percent complete. This design is by the district engineer, Washington, D.C.; estimated cost of design is $42,000.

Preliminary design for security fence and perimeter road is 85 percent complete. This design is by Thos. B. Bourne Associates, Washington, D.C.; estimated cost of design is $8,000.

Preliminary design for the extension of runway is 90 percent complete. This design is by Thos. B. Bourne Associates, Washington, D.C.; estimated cost of design is $8,000.

Preliminary design for the flight training building is 10 percent complete. This design is by Thos. B. Bourne Associates, Washington, D.C.; estimated cost of design is $6,000.

POSSIBLE USE OF EXISTING FACILITIES FOR AIRCRAFT REQUIREMENT

What additional study have you made as to the possible use of existing facilities in the Metropolitan Washington area for this aircraft requirement?

General SEEMAN. This Davison Army Airfield provides air service for the Military District of Washington. The commander and his staff have reviewed the various other facilities in the metropolitan area which, as you know, are Andrews, Bolling, Anacostia, the Washintgon National Airport, and the possibility of the Dulles, the new international airport.

This was rather thoroughly gone into.

It is true that this type of operation could probably be squeezed in.

On the other hand, it is a mission intimately connected with the post at Fort Belvoir, with the Army staff, and, as you know, they have a number of White House missions.

The fixed wing flying, as I understand it, is to be terminated at Bolling. A major element of the work at Davison is the rotary wing, a helicopter service.

If it were possible—and it would be possible—to utilize Bolling for a rotary wing operation, we would do two things—we first would be mixing rotary wing into this air traffic around the present Washington National Airport, Anacostia, and Andrews, which does not occur from their present location at Davison; second, we would take a small field operation at Davison and split it in two and try to maintain an operation at Bolling. Therefore on this basis this particular possibility would not be feasible.

The conclusions of the Washington district staff is that this place, where they already have a sizable investment of some $5 or $6 million, is the place to concentrate this special service that is needed in this area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would insert in the record a table showing flights from this installation, noting the ones for combat readiness flying.

General SEEMAN. We have a statement that during a 12-month period ending the 31st of October 1959, 72,640 aviation operations were required out of Davison. Just how much of that was R. & D. testing, how much administrative flights, and how much more or less combat aircraft, we will provide that information.

(The information requested follows:)

Aircraft operations at Davison U.S. Army Airfield during the 12-month period ending October 31, 1959, were as follows:

	Percent of total	Number of flights
Operational and administrative	57	41,550
Combat readiness flying	28	20,450
Transient	14	10,200
Other (R. & D., etc.)	1	440
Total		72,640

TELEPHONE SERVICE TO CAPEHART AND WHERRY HOUSING AREAS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why cannot the telephone service to the Capehart and Wherry housing areas be supplied by commercial telephone companies individually rather than by the military?

I ask that question because recently there has been a considerable amount of renovation in your communications systems. Certain of these functions were removed from the military and put under contract.

General SEEMAN. I appreciate that viewpoint from our past hearings, Mr. Chairman. We went into this item specifically.

The telephone systems at these locations, of which Belvoir is one, are owned by the Government.

However, the Government furnishes building space for telephone equipment regardless of the ownership of such facilities. The telephone charges which the Government would pay if these systems were commercially owned would be the regulatory tariff rates which are based on space being furnished at the expense of the customer.

The Army proposes to sell approximately 30 of these systems for continued use on a commercially owned basis when these sales are legally authorized. The Army will continue to furnish telephone operators for these systems regardless of ownership. This is a normal industry practice and not peculiar to the Army.

At Belvoir specifically, an addition to the present communications building is proposed to permit expansion of the present 4,000-line dial system to 5,600 lines to meet the requirements for service.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That has to do with the Capehart and Wherry housing requirements?

General SEEMAN. Capehart is one of the requirements.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are the Wherry jobs the same?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. NORWOOD. The Wherry housing project at Fort Belvoir is presently serviced by the C. & P. Telephone Co. In talking to the signal officer at Fort Belvoir about this he said that the telephone company is not at all interested in serving this facility.

Apparently they are involved in a big capital outlay in additional cables and structures to service this area, and——

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is a very logical approach from some points of view, but you have a public utility here. They are supposed to develop

a system to take care of the workload. The military is as much of a workload as the civilian area.

By having this service there you will obviate a lot of additional work and time yourselves because this way you will have to take care of charges or get money through other appropriations by having local service people take care of it. I am not concerned about the inclination of the public utility.

Mr. NORWOOD. I did not finish, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Go ahead.

Mr. NORWOOD. The Wherry projects are served now in the way of party lines, up to 10 people on 1 line. In other words, it is unsatisfactory service.

The post signal facility there is designed to accommodate a certain workload. It has these other loads added to those which it is now serving. Capehart is on a party line system.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The party line system is again the subject of a commission ruling. Just because you have 10 party lines or 8 party lines, which I will admit is not very good having been part of one myself once, I do not blame people for objecting to a 10-party line, but that does not obviate the fact that the public utility is called upon to serve the public. That is what the commissions of the States decide when they listen to applications, whether or not the public utility should be directed by the commission to serve that area.

My next question obviously is this: Has any application been made to the controlling commission, or whatever political subdivision you might have in Virginia, for the public utilities to serve that area to cut down the number of parties on one line?

Mr. NORWOOD. I have no answer to that.

General SEEMAN. We will supply that information for the record.

(The information requested follows:)

The Department of the Army has not taken any action with regulatory commissions regarding telephone service to the occupants of the former Wherry housing. However, Fort Belvoir personnel made informal inquiry to the telephone company regarding improvement in service to these quarters. The local telephone company authorities indicated that the company has no plans for expanding facilities in the Wherry area at Fort Belvoir. No further action has been taken with the company as it is the intention of the Army to convert the telephone service for these Government quarters to the post telephone system.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to ask that they supply also any direct request made to the telephone company which is the starting point. I thoroughly agree with the chairman that a public utility has an obligation to render service.

I recognize that it may not be necessary to go that far if you would take it up with the telephone company directly and insist on the service. If they can get the money from the service they would be smart enough businesswise to let you put out the capital investment instead of them.

I would like the record to show what procedures you have followed.

General SEEMAN. It may have been, sir, that the Fort Belvoir Command Staff and the Military District Staff, in view of the fact that even if this were done we would still have to furnish the operators, we still would have to provide the structure, then the requirement for security and emergency need might be such as to tip the balance.

Mr. WHITTEN. The question is what have you actually done and what it is possible to get somebody else to do? The record should be made based on fact and not what might have happened.

(The information requested follows:)

The former Wherry housing at Fort Belvoir has been acquired by the Government, which changed the status of these housing units from off-post privately owned housing to on-post Government-owned quarters under complete military control. On this basis, it is the intent of the Army to provide telephone service to these quarters from the Fort Belvoir telephone system. No additional service to these quarters will be required from the telephone company when the post telephone service is provided.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If the public utilities enter into that operation you would not have to furnish the operators because you are working on a dial system in that area. Your operators would be provided, particularly where a public utility is involved and particularly where long distance comes into play. They are careful as to who handles long-distance calls.

Is there an exception made there?

Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. NORWOOD. I would not as an engineer want this item jeopardized because I conscientiously believe it is a valid requirement. If you go there and see it you will concur. Not that Wherry housing influenced your opinion on this item, sir, but that is my opinion.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Aside from the housing requirements what demand do you have on the local board? How many line services do you have on the board?

Mr. NORWOOD. We are using 90 percent of the current capacity daily. In other words, we have 3,850 of the 4,000 lines in the facility used now. That is technically inadequate to operate a communications facility, a telephone facility.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, if you are operating at 90 percent of capacity on the present board it is inadequate to handle the present load?

Perhaps I misinterpreted your statement.

Mr. NORWOOD. It is handling the present load in the Capeharts.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Leave that aside. The present board will handle your load up to 90 percent exclusive of the Capeharts and exclusive of the old Wherry. Is that correct?

Mr. NORWOOD. That is not quite correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Correct it.

Mr. NORWOOD. We are using 90 percent of the lines in the facility——

Mr. SHEPPARD. Wait a minute.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, what you are trying to tell me is this: While you have 10 percent of your board capacity available, that within itself would not be capable of handling your present load, and the problems that develop due to atmospheric conditions, storms knocking down lines, would not give you the capacity to take care of the additional Capehart and Wherry. Is that correct generally?

General SEEMAN. That is correct. They make the statment they will have to curtail some of the other telephone usage in the operational areas in order to fulfill this function.

I believe the Signal Corps has a figure of 85 percent as the figure they view with alarm.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If that is true you are 5 percent below the alarm area.

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

Colonel EVANS. There is also a concern of a post commander or a station commander of having a split operation on the post. If it is all commercial, that is one thing. If it is half commercial and half post, and from these quarters you have people on alert availability, that is a considerable drawback in the post operations per se.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is just wonderful and I do not blame you for having that idea. However, in your breakdowns, where you have separations from the whole operation and go straight across with a public utility, you still have mixed operations. You have at least 32, and 24 still maintain hazardous operations on the post. The rest is still in that category and forgotten.

To relieve the situation out there suppose you put another panel on the board you have? I believe a panel runs quite a percentage of the load you have. Get away from the family calls and the back-kitchen operation which is a headache to anybody, anyway. Every time you get into that kind of operation you are in trouble because you have squawks coming from everybody.

General SEEMAN. Sir, this is exactly what this is. This is 4,500 square feet to have the Signal Corps add another panel. This is merely the structure.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are still tying in the housing project on a military operation when it could be handled through the direct operation of the utility—two services for which you have not applied.

You still want to take on your additional headaches and costs, which come from such projects as Wherry and Capehart.

From the standpoint of a business operation there is a vast difference in handling these calls.

I will not belabor that issue any further.

Mr. WHITTEN. Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

SEWAGE DISPOSAL

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are the local agents within the Fort Belvoir area treating sewage disposal to the same or better standards than contemplated by the sewer plant improvement?

General SEEMAN. No, sir. Our desire is to provide nothing superior to what civilian communities are required to provide. At the present time we have two plants at Belvoir, one which provides primary and secondary treatment and one which provides primary treatment alone.

The second plant handles about three times as much as the first plant. New construction coming in will place a load 150 percent greater on this second plant.

The policy regarding the pollution is established by Executive order which requires cooperation with State authorities.

Mr. SHEPPARD. So far as I am concerned you can stop right there for this reason: There is no occasion for the military loaning itself to contamination of any area contrary to the State laws of sanitation which prevail. If you are doing that, you had better get yourselves straightened out. If you haven't enough load capacity to take care of it with the present sewerage system, obviously you should have a second one.

General SEEMAN. We request a secondary treatment for that plant.

MISSION AND ANTICIPATED USE OF DAVIDSON ARMY AIRFIELD

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the extreme sensitivity of the mission assigned to the Davidson Army Airfield, gentlemen?

General SEEMAN. This refers to its executive department mission for the President.

Mr. SHEPPARD. For the what?

General SEEMAN. It has a White House mission.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on this item?

The gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. WHITTEN. Where are you doing the air operations now that you would move to Belvoir?

General SEEMAN. They are being done there now, sir. They have a fixed wing small Army liaison type craft runway, and they have a rotary wing landing area. The rotary wing landing area is now out of commission, not because it is not usable, but because it is being used for parking space. For example, they are using a temporary building a mile and a half away for their Link training. They train their fliers that way. They have a warehouse building 2 miles away which is being used for their aircraft spare parts.

They have certain of their hangar space that is being utilized for administrative space in the detachment headquarters. These requests are normal and make more efficient use of the area.

Mr. WHITTEN. The general has testified that there are operating facilities to operate this flight at Belvoir but they are not using them now because they are using space for parking.

If you park aircraft there to the point you cannot use the field, it looks to me like what you should be requesting is a parking area rather than a new operation.

Let me ask this: How much increase—it will all be increase if you are not using it now—but how much use would be made of these facilities in your judgment if you had these facilities provided? How many flights would there be?

General SEEMAN. The figure they provided us, up until the 31st of October, for a 12-month period, was 72,640 operations.

Mr. WHITTEN. You are not using it now because you have planes parked there. How are the flights being handled now?

General SEEMAN. They are handled on a very closely spaced schedule in a congested manner, where you are mixing both rotary and fixed wing takeoffs on the same strips.

Mr. WHITTEN. Of the flights you anticipate, where are they by and large?

General SEEMAN. This is the experience at Davison.

Mr. WHITTEN. Are Davison and Fort Belvoir the same thing?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. This will not provide for any increased use, but would be merely to make it more convenient for you?

General SEEMAN. It will be safer.

Mr. WHITTEN. My question again is, does this contemplate increased use or is it to carry on the present use?

General SEEMAN. It carries on its present use. To my knowledge, there is no increased deployment of troops to this area. The planes that are used for research and development work and testing, of course this is not——

Mr. WHITTEN. You project this on 72,000 flights. That is all right for projection, but could we have for the record the actual count and the number of flights being presently handled?

General SEEMAN. This is the actual count. What I do not have is what we project for the future. If you desire that I will supply it.

Mr. WHITTEN. General, would it require any change in fitting into the safety plan in and around Washington? In other words, has this been cleared with General Quesada's FAA or is it advocated by the civilian agency that is supposed to have some degree of control of the flight pattern in and around Washington?

General SEEMAN. It has been entirely cleared with the FAA. In the Washington area they control the traffic up to a certain district.

Mr. WHITTEN. Is it recommended by them or just satisfactory to them?

General SEEMAN. It was recommended by them, that they not mix in the present congested area and the metropolitan area so by reverse we can see it was recommended by the Army stay at Davidson.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. WHITTEN. I have been trying to develop just what was involved in the statements made. That clears the matter up so far as I am concerned.

Thank you, Mr. Chariman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The gentleman on my left?

Mr. JONAS. I have one or two questions.

General, you said Bolling was not adequate for this mission but you did not say why.

General SEEMAN. Our understanding, sir, is that Bolling is eventually to be closed for fixed-wing operations, which then would leave presumably the consideration of whether we could bring in rotary wing, helicopter operations. If we did that when we would be putting those rotary wing operation right into the pattern or very close to the pattern, of the Washington National Airport which back and forth to the Pentagon would be right straight across, first, and second, we would be splitting the operating problems of this little detachment out at Davison Field. They would have to pick up some overhead and other functions at Bolling as well as maintain their base.

Mr. JONAS. Actually, your problem at Davison is Shirley Highway, is it not? Are you not right on top of Shirley Highway with your runway?

General SEEMAN. Not so. We are asking for some clearance easements to be able to top the trees and get an easement in the flight and glide angle.

Mr. JONAS. We had some testimony last year from some civilians. Did you read that?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. They protested against any expansion of Davison, on the ground that the area was too congested or becoming too congested to justify expanding aircraft activity there.

General SEEMAN. I know of no great expansion in prospect here.

Mr. JONAS. It seems to me the young man who testified in opposition to this last year indicated some other installations nearby.

Was that A. P. Hill? Do they have runways at A. P. Hill?

General SEEMAN. A. P. Hill is down near Fredericksburg. It is

below Fredericksburg. I do not know whether they have runways there or not.

Mr. JONAS. It is east, is it not, not south?

General SEEMAN. It is south and southeast.

Mr. JONAS. South of Belvoir?

General SEEMAN. Thirty or forty miles.

Colonel EVANS. It is southeast of Fredericksburg.

General SEEMAN. There are other air strips comparable.

Mr. JONAS. The new Dulles Airport is coming up. It looks to me, with the Bolling facilities we might be able to keep from expanding that airport down at Davison.

General SEEMAN. These are just largely safety measures, to take care of their existing workload. There are other things. There is a small flying field at Groveton, right up above or just outside of Alexandria. There used to be a small Navy installation down at Hybla Valley on Route 1. They are scattered airports.

Mr. JONAS. That is all I have.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Insofar as you know, gentlemen, and I am interested in this equally with everybody else because your landing records out there have been good. I have not heard of any particular localized crash in this area.

So far as the hazard to the President is concerned, we are all conscious of that, with all due respect. Anytime a plane is called for White House service it is my understanding that everything upstairs is cleared. Do you know whether that is a fact?

General SEEMAN. That is my understanding.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Insofar as that hazard is concerned within itself, not referring to any other possible hazard, that situation is automatically taken care of.

Colonel EVANS. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Jonas.

Mr. JONAS. What is the length of the present runway?

Mr. NORWOOD. Thirty-one hundred feet.

Mr. JONAS. You want to add only 300 feet?

Mr. NORWOOD. Yes, sir, to make it safe. That is the sole reason.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there further questions, Mr. Jonas?

Mr. JONAS. No, sir.

TRANSPORTATION CORPS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Taking up the Transportation Corps, Mr. Reporter, you will insert page 132 in the record.

(The page referred to follows:)

[In thousands of dollars]

	Prior authorization	Proposed authorization	Proposed funding
Transportation	1,095	1,702	2,797
Brooklyn Army Terminal, N.Y.	0	607	607
Fort Eustis, Va	1,095	1,095	2,190

BROOKLYN ARMY TERMINAL, N.Y.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The first project is the Brooklyn Army Terminal, N.Y.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Brooklyn Army Terminal	New York	Permanent	NY-901
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
New York	Kings	Transportation Corps	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Port of Embarkation		1919	Active

II - MISSION

Port of shipment and receipt of military cargo and personnel.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	107	144	2758		3,009
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	170	484	3460		4,114

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	100	$ 8,787,599	$ 38,838,110	$ 47,625,709
2. LEASED	6	($ 23,477)		$ 0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959 (Except Land Rent)				$ 47,625,709
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 607,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 14,636,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 62,868,709

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDS. 30June59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDS. 30June59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
821	14	Replace 2 Steam Generators	134	BTU	112 mil	123 mil	0	123 mil	607	0	607	607

133

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Final design for item to replace two steam generators is 100 percent complete. This design is by Vogelbach & Bauman, Jersey City, N.J., at a cost of $34,000.

108

267

Can you assure the committee that the Brooklyn Army Terminal will stay in operation at least at its present capacity in the future?

If so, to what extent are you projecting your answer into the future?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir. There is no foreseeable—this is the last major terminal the Army has on the east coast. There is no foreseeable plan for any deactivation here, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How long will it take to amortize this expenditure for steam generators based on an annual savings, gentlemen?

General SEEMAN. This will cut down operational costs at a savings of $10,000. In a straight line it would take 60 years according to this cost. My understanding of this particular one, Mr. Chairman, is that the present six 40-year-old boilers are at the end of their rope.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How long have they been in existence? Did you say 20 years?

General SEEMAN. Forty years service is the information we have, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions upon the item?

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

FORT EUSTIS, VA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next is Fort Eustis, Va., on pages 135 and 136.

Final design for item to replace two steam generators is 100 percent complete. This design is by Vogelbach & Bauman, Jersey City, N.J., at a cost of $34,000.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Fort Eustis	Virginia	Permanent	Va-80-80A & 80P
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Williamsburg, 12 miles NW	Newport News	Transportation Corps	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Training		1918	Active

II - MISSION

Fort Eustis is designated by the Department of the Army as a permanent post of the United States Army Transportation Corps for use as a U.S. Army Transportation Training Command. The specific mission of the post is the organization and training of Transportation Corps units and individuals of all categories, responsible for logistic support of the Transportation School, The Transportation Research and Engineering Command, and the satellite post of Fort Story, Virginia.

*One time cost for easement.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	1224	7933	2398		11,555
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	2027	12019	2865		16,911

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	9,301	$ 767,723	$ 82,249,471	$ 83,017,194
2. LEASED	17	($ 1,493*)		$ 1,493
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959 (Except Land Rent)				$ 83,018,687
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 8,930,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 1,095,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 84,219,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 177,262,687

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30June59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30Jun59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30June59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
~~179~~	~~199~~	~~Trainfire I Range~~	~~137~~	~~DLR~~	~~0~~	~~LS~~	~~0~~	~~LS~~	~~262~~	~~0~~	~~262~~	~~262~~ 266
610	178	2 Battalion Headquarters Buildings	139	SF	22,656	52,872	0	5,156	1,200	0	117	117 271
721	204	Mechanical Ventilation-Barracks	140	DLR	0	LS	0	LS	716	0	716	716 272
711	845. 300	275 Family Quarters (Capehart)	141	FAM	1,494	3,173	223	275	—	—	—	—
									SUB-TOTAL		~~1,095~~ 833	~~1,095~~ 833
					135							

DA FORM 1674-R 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

110

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (Continued)

INSTALLATION NAME	DATE
	1 Mar 1960

CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30June59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30Jun59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30June59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
711	845. 301	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	142	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 302	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	143	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 303	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	144	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 304	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	145	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 305	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	146	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 306	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	147	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 307	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	148	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 308	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	149	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 309	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	150	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 310	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	151	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 311	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	152	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 312	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	153	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 313	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	154	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 314	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	155	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 315	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	156	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 316	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	157	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 317	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	158	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 318	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	159	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 319	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	160	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 320	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	161	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 321	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	162	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 322	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	163	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 323	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	164	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 324	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	165	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 325	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	166	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 326	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	167	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 327	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	168	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 328	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	169	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 329	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	170	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 330	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	171	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 331	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	172	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 332	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	173	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 333	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	174	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 334	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	175	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 335	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	176	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 336	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	177	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 337	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	178	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 338	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	179	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 339	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	180	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 340	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	181	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 341	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	182	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 342	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	183	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 343	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	184	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 344	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	185	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 345	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	186	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 346	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	187	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 347	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	188	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 348	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	189	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 349	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	190	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 350	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	191	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 351	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	192	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 352	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	193	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 353	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	194	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 354	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	195	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 355	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	196	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 356	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	197	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 357	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	198	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 358	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	199	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 359	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	200	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 360	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	201	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 361	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	202	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 362	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	203	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 363	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	204	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 364	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	205	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 365	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	206	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 366	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	207	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 367	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	208	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 368	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	209	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 369	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	210	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 370	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	211	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 371	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	212	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 372	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	213	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 373	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	214	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 374	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	215	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 375	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	216	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 376	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	217	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 377	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	218	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 378	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	219	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 379	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	220	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 380	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	221	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 381	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	222	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 382	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	223	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 383	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	224	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 384	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	225	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 385	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	226	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 386	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	227	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 387	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	228	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 388	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	229	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 389	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	230	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 390	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	231	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 391	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	232	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 392	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	233	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 393	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	234	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 394	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	235	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 395	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	236	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 396	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	237	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 397	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	238	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 398	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	239	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 399	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	240	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 400	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	241	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 401	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	242	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 402	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	243	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 403	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	244	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 404	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	245	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 405	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	246	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 406	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	247	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 407	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	248	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 408	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	249	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 409	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	250	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 410	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	251	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 411	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	252	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 412	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	253	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 413	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	254	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 414	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	255	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 415	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	256	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 416	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	257	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 417	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	258	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 418	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	259	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 419	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	260	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 420	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	261	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 421	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	262	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 422	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	263	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 423	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	264	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 424	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	265	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 425	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	266	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 426	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	267	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 427	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	268	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 428	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	269	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 429	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	270	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 430	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	271	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 431	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	272	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 432	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	273	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 433	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	274	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
711	845. 434	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	275	FAM	1,494	1,173	223	100	—	—	—	—
									SUB-TOTAL		~~10,000~~ 8,330	~~10,000~~ 8,330

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (Continued)

INSTALLATION NAME: Fort Eustis

DATE: 1 Mar 1960

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)				
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 ~~June~~ 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30June59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30June59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m	
		Prior Authorization											
		P.L. 85/241											
721	186	Enlisted Womens Barracks	142	Spaces	6,004	2,508	1,071	0	5,200	2,244	0	384	265
		P.L. 85/685											
610	7	Training Command Headquarters Building	143	SF	0	27,894	27,894	0	711	711	0	711	203
										TOTAL	~~1,095~~ 833	~~2,190~~ 1928	

136

DA FORM 1674a-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

(See notes on top of following page.)

Design for the trainfire range has not been started. Estimated cost of design is $13,000.

Preliminary design for the two battalion headquarters buildings is 100 percent complete. This design is by the district engineer, Norfolk, Va.; estimated design cost is $5,000.

Preliminary design for mechanical ventilation of barracks is 95 percent complete. This design is by the district engineer, Norfolk, Va.; estimated design cost is $10,000.

Preliminary design for EW barracks is 10 percent complete. This design is by the district engineer, Norfolk, Va.; estimated design cost is $19,000.

Final design for the training command headquarters building is 100 percent complete. This design is by Mills, Petticord & Mills, Washington, D.C., at a cost of $35,000.

How many permanent barracks space are authorized or in being at Fort Eustis?

General SEEMAN. Might I go back, Mr. Chairman, on one thing? On page 135, that has a trainfire range which we are respectfully requesting be withdrawn.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That has been lined out of my justifications.

General SEEMAN. To answer your question regarding the barracks, at Fort Eustis we have actual permanent barracks, 6,004 spaces.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is your total authorization there?

General SEEMAN. Our total strength as of the current or present time is 7,933 enlisted men, sir, total military strength, officers and enlisted men, of approximately 9,100.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the present enlisted population of this installation?

General SEEMAN. The figure given in our page 135 is 7,933 enlisted strength. That is as of June 30, 1959; a figure of October 31, 1959, is 8,894.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How many barracks do you have here for mobilization reserve as of now or the most recent date you can give the answer?

General SEEMAN. We have a total, gross enlisted men's barracks space at Fort Eustis of 15,574. Of those I gave the figure of permanent as 6,004. There are 752 of the improved barracks spaces and there are 8,818 of the old World War II unimproved, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And they are on mobilization standby?

General SEEMAN. They will be maintained as long as they are an asset in being for emergency use.

Mr. SHEPPARD. So at the moment then you do not have any set-asides under the mobilization reserve?

General SEEMAN. These unimproved ones are set aside.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for battalion headquarters space at the present time?

General SEEMAN. They are presently using some space diverted out of their barracks. The headquarters building was not built at the time the barracks were built and they have had to divert some of the barracks space.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What change has been made in regulations and when were they made which permit the air cooling of the barracks in that area? Are they part of the regulation that included certain geographical circumferences, as it were, for the acceptance of air conditioning?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir. This is the coordination which is done by the Department of Defense in their air-conditioning and air-cooling regulation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In your answer insert the number of the regulation and the date it was issued, will you please?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

Department of Defense Instruction No. 4270.7 prescribes conditions and allowances for installation of air conditioning, evaporative cooling, dehumidification and mechanical ventilation. This publication was issued on November 10, 1958.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When were these barracks constructed and when was the regulation changed?

General SEEMAN. We will provide the actual year these were constructed, sir.

(Information requested follows:)

Of the 16 barracks proposed to be ventilated by this project, 4 were authorized in fiscal year 1951 and completed in July 1953 and 12 were authorized in fiscal year 1952 and completed in November 1953.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What authority do you have to exceed the cost per enlisted personnel as authorized by law in the construction of the barracks in this program?

General SEEMAN. The enlisted women's barracks have an additional square foot allowance, as I understand it.

Mr. NORWOOD. The law pertains to enlisted men, the standard enlisted men's barracks. These are special barracks for enlisted women in small numbers and have different requirements than the men do.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do these barracks that you are requesting here all fall within that category?

Mr. NORWOOD. Yes, sir; they are all for women.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for training command headquarters building at the present time?

General SEEMAN. They are presently using their World War II temporary structures in the area, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What has developed where you find it necessary to air-condition these facilities?

General SEEMAN. The same general thing. This is permitted in the current regulations, zoning from the southern part of the country up within certain specific temperature and humidity guidelines.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What do you consider will be the annual savings that will occur as a result of this construction, if any?

General SEEMAN. The Training Command Headquarters estimate they will make an annual savings of $72,600. They are going to eliminate, they estimate, 17 messengers and maintenance personnel. By pulling the operations into a more central building, they will be able to make a saving. They plan to demolish the existing scattered buildings. They are using now bits and pieces of 14 of these frame buildings.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Because of the potential savings to which you referred or others, if there are others, what do you consider the amortization time element would be?

General SEEMAN. The estimate here is that it would pay for itself in less than 10 years.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions upon this item?

Mr. JONAS. I am not quite satisfied about the necessity to include these cooling systems in the barracks. I can understand your need for cooling in the daytime in your office facilities but are you going to justify air-conditioning barracks in Virginia?

General SEEMAN. For the barracks, sir, it is only mechanical ventilation.

Mr. JONAS. It is going to cost $698,000. That is a pretty big sum of money.

General SEEMAN. For 16 buildings.

Mr. JONAS. I understand. It is sleeping quarters, is it not?

General SEEMAN. Sleeping and their off-duty dayrooms.

Mr. JONAS. I live two or three hundred miles south of Fort Eustis and I do not have air conditioning in my home or mechanical ventilation, either. Do you really think it is necessary in that climate?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir. Where people are living together in groups—I do not have air conditioning in my home, particularly. I do have fans, circulating fans and that is about what this amounts to. It is just a matter of the physical condition of the men during periods of high temperature and high humidity in this tidewater area.

Mr. JONAS. That is all.

MEDICAL

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we shall take up the Medical projects and insert page 145 of the justifications in the record.

(The page follows:)

[In thousands of dollars]

	Prior authorization	Proposed authorization	Proposed funding
Medical	0	861	861
Madigan General Hospital, Washington	0	73	73
Walter Reed Army Medical Center, District of Columbia	0	788	788

MADIGAN GENERAL HOSPITAL, WASH.

The first item is the Madigan General Hospital.

DATE 1 Mar 1960
DEPARTMENT ARMY
FISCAL YEAR 1961
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Madigan General Hospital	Washington	Permanent	Wash-14
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Tacoma, 11 miles NE	Pierce	The Surgeon General	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Specialized Hospital		1943	Active

II - MISSION

Operation of medical treatment facility designated as a specialized treatment center; specialties as designated by The Surgeon General, operates a professional teaching program and special research facilities. Conducts research and training medical personnel and general reserve units as directed by The Surgeon General.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	232	492	436		1160
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	218	530	388		1136

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	120	$ 0	$ 6,203,353	$ 6,203,353
2. LEASED	0	($)		$ 0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959 (Except Land Rent)				$ 6,203,353
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 73,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 3,265,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 9,541,353

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY					PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30Jun59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30Jun59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30Jun59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
530	29	Pharmacy	147	SF	0	2,475	0	2,475	73	0	73	73
												268
					146							

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Final design for the pharmacy is 80 percent complete. This design is by the district engineer, Seattle, Wash.; estimated cost of design is $4,000.

What are you using for a pharmacy facility at the present time, and what consideration have you given to the use of existing facilities?

General SEEMAN. The pharmacy at the present time is located in an inactive ward building which is inadequate. They had to improve some laboratory space there and displace the pharmacy. The requirements of the service are such that we have had to make this request, Mr. Chairman. They have a tremendous workload there. Madigan is on the station at Fort Lewis. McChord Air Force Base, as well as Fort Lewis, is supported through Madigan. The pharmacy workload in 1957 averaged 14,945 prescriptions per month. This is a reflection of the changed type of medical work where you do relatively more outpatient work than inpatient bed treatment as in previous years. During 1959, an average of over 26,000 prescriptions per month were filled.

WALTER REED ARMY MEDICAL CENTER

Mr. SHEPPARD. If there are no questions, we shall proceed to the next item, the Walter Reed Army Medical Center.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM
1 - INSTALLATION DATA
FISCAL YEAR 1961
DEPARTMENT ARMY
DATE 1 Mar 1960
4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Walter Reed Army Medical Center	District of Columbia and Maryland	Permanent	DC-700
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Washington, D. C.	District of Columbia & Montgomery Co., Md.	The Surgeon General	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT Hospital, Research & Development, Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, Armed Forces Institute of Pathology, Army Prosthetic Research Laboratory		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY** 1908	**10. STATUS** Active

II - MISSION

Treatment of sick and injured personnel of the Armed Services and their dependents. Medical Research and Development. Support of all Walter Reed Army Medical Center activities.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	926	1894	2426		5246
2. LONG RANGE (Phase D)	860	1747	2499		5106

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	113	$ 683,014	$ 21,891,649	$ 22,574,663
2. LEASED	0	($)		$ 0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959			(Except Land Rent)	$ 22,574,663
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 9,450,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 788,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 52,017,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 84,829,000

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
442	31	Service Building	150	SF	43,884	80,000	0	80,000	788	0	788	788

149

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Preliminary design for the service building is 15 percent complete. This design is by Ronald S. Senseman, Washington, D.C.; estimated cost of design is $40,000.

What are you presently using for space for this service facility?

General SEEMAN. This request, Mr. Chairman, is a repetition of a project which we had before you last year. It is a warehouse building to bring together warehousing operations and storage operations now scattered throughout the station. At the present time they have some medical supplies stored in the basement of the nurses' quarters, which is contrary to fire regulations. They have some supplies in the subbasement of the boiler plant, which has an earth floor. They have seven old CCC buildings of pre-World War II construction which they are using for Quartermaster storage. Of course they are without sprinkler or fire alarm facilities.

The concept of this is to pull together 80,000 square feet of space and place it at one location. I believe this is not directly on Walter Reed proper, but at the Forest Glen station.

I stand corrected: It did not come before you last year. We did not get it past the Bureau of the Budget, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What consideration have you given here with regard to using the existing facilities at other locations?

General SEEMAN. Part of the authorized storage of Walter Reed Medical Center is now stored at Indiantown Gap, Pa. It was our desire to bring this required backup into the Walter Reed area. We looked over the possibility of placing it all somewhere else. We are using some now out at the GSA area in Franconia, but there is insufficient space at these other outlying stations as well as the inefficiency of making use of it.

Colonel HASTINGS. If you will excuse me, sir, we also made inquiries for space in the area of the National Institutes of Health, the Dalecarlia Reservoir, Naval Observatory, Naval Security Installation, Naval Ordnance Lab, and the Soldiers' Home.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What consideration have you given to use of space at the Naval Weapons Plant?

General SEEMAN. I do not believe that was considered in the study, that being an ordnance and industrial type facility.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There are no storage facilities available there?

General SEEMAN. I am sure there probably would be storage facilities available there if it were discontinued in service as a weapons plant. Whether or not it would fit into the complex, I do not know.

It would certainly be more convenient than Alexandria or Franconia or other locations across the river.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think you should be able to give us the answer before we close these hearings, if you will. Contact the Navy and see what the story is on that, will you, please?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And put that in the record.

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

The Superintendent, Naval Weapons Plant, contacted on March 31, 1960, stated that there was no space available which could be allocated to Walter Reed Army Medical Center for warehouse purposes, nor would the contemplated changes in the operations of the plant result in available space.

First Army

Mr. Sheppard. Now we shall turn to the First Army projects and insert page 156 in the record.

(The page follows:)

[In thousands of dollars]

	Prior authorization	Proposed authorization	Proposed funding
First Army	1,726	2,157	3,883
Fort Devens, Mass.	0	2,157	2,157
Fort Dix, N.J.	1,726	0	1,726

FORT DEVENS, MASS.

Mr. Sheppard. The first item is Fort Devens.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Fort Devens	Massachusetts	Permanent	Mass-201
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Boston, 30 miles E	Middlesex and Worcester	First US Army	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Non-Divisional Troops		1917	Active

II - MISSION

Responsible for the command, training and operations, and to provide administrative and logistical support for Class I and Class II units and activities assigned or attached to Fort Devens and for its sub-installations, Camp Wellfleet and Fort Banks; to support the training of reserve components as directed by the Commanding General, First U.S. Army; to support New England NIKE sites and XIII Corps Headquarters US Army (Reserves).

*One time cost for easement.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	964	10,219	1,423		12,606
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	1186	15,509	1,375		18,070

IV - INVENTORY

	LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED		10,118	$ 651,800	$ 51,646,900	$ 52,298,700
2. LEASED		2	(@ 200*)		$ 200
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959 (Except Land Rent)					$ 52,298,900
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY					$ 6,949,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST					$ 2,157,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION					$ 90,634,000
7. GRAND TOTAL					$ 152,038,900

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATIONS OUTSTANDS. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATIONS OUTSTANDS. 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
722	36	2 El Barracks w/o Mess	158	MEN	2,198	11,106	1,304	652	22,000	2,666	1,289	1,289 240
723	41	Battalion Mess Building	159	SF	13,280	185,920	26,560	13,280	5,600	675	400	400 241
723	106	Battalion Administration & Supply Bldg	160	SF	13,000	182,000	26,000	13,000	4,000	458	297	297 242
821	110	Heating Plant	161	LTU	-0-	140 mil	20 mil	11.2 mil	1,200	150	171	171 243
										TOTAL	2,157	2,157

157

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

120

batalion centers, maintenance shops, and other facilities. The Army has established a policy that the quantity of troop housing will not exceed 110% of the number of troops to be housed. Current programs for troop housing at Fort Devens will exceed this limit by approximately 1,000 spaces. Therefore, the Army has directed that the troop housing program at Fort Devens be reduced by 1,000 spaces. The Army has also established a policy that the number of troops assigned to a post will not exceed the capacity of the dining facilities. The dining facilities at Fort Devens are adequate for 10,000 troops. The Army has directed that the troop strength at Fort Devens be reduced to 10,000 troops. The Army has also established a policy that the number of troops assigned to a post will not exceed the capacity of the dining facilities. The dining facilities at Fort Devens are adequate for 10,000 troops. The Army has directed that the troop strength at Fort Devens be reduced to 10,000 troops.

Preliminary design of the two EM barracks, the battalion mess building, the battalion administration and supply building, and the heating plant is 100 percent complete. Design is by Linenthal & Becker, Inc., Boston, Mass.; estimated design cost is $23,000, $12,000, $8,000, and $6,000, respectively.

What type of facilities presently house the personnel slated for these barracks, and what will be done with these facilities if this request is granted?

General SEEMAN. This is part of our program for permanent barracks to gradually replace the World War II temporary frame barracks. At Fort Devens, 2,688 spaces of the frame barracks have been improved. However, the remainder are unimproved and the existing temporary barracks which are located in the areas of the long-range construction will be demolished.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are you able to meet the training requirements of the troops at Fort Devens without problems at this location?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir. I believe there is a battle group stationed at Fort Devens. They provide the support for the 1st Army area and largely in the summertime on the reserve training missions for the Reserve and the guard. A number of them go to Camp Drum which, as you know, is a guard and Reserve training center. The training space at Devens is adequate. It is not one of our larger stations, but is the only major Regular Army troop unit in the 1st Army area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What consideration, if any, has been given to either closing this installation or changing its use to a headquarters type function, transferring at least the training portion to another location or locations?

General SEEMAN. As I have mentioned, it is the only Regular Army troop unit of battle group stature in the 1st Army. It is needed to support the Reserve and other facilities training in the summertime, as well as to garrison them. Fort Devens could not support a major training mission such as at Fort Bragg or Fort Sill. It is considered in the Army complex as the strength changes, as to its relative advantages and disadvantages. There was consideration at one time to maintaining it at old Camp Drum. It is largely composed of temporary facilities, and, also it is farther north and it would be much more expensive to maintain as a year-round operation.

On that basis, as of the present time we continue at Fort Devens.

In addition, it is headquarters for certain air defense in that area, also.

FORT DIX, N.J.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is Fort Dix, N.J.

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

FISCAL YEAR: 1961 | DEPARTMENT: ARMY | DATE: 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Fort Dix	New Jersey	Permanent	NJ-101
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Trenton, 16 miles NW	Burlington and Ocean	First U. S. Army	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Training - Infantry		1917	Active

II - MISSION

To be responsible for the Command, Training and operations of, and to provide administrative logistical support of units and activities assigned or attached to Fort Dix. To provide administrative and logistical support for other units, activities, and installations, as directed. To prepare plans and coordinate planning with other agencies as directed to include Air Raid, Domestic Emergency, Civil Defense, Mobilization and local defense plans.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 Jun 59	1944	27132	1885		30,961
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	2125	29704	1885		33,714

IV - INVENTORY

	LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED		32,606	$ 2,128,300	$ 94,894,700	$ 97,023,000
2. LEASED		0	($)		$ 0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 Jun 1959				(Except Land Rent)	$ 97,023,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY					$ 15,965,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST					$ 0
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION					$ 85,027,000
7. GRAND TOTAL					$ 198,015,000

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)				
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m	
		Prior Authorization - PL 86/685											
722	9	EM Barracks (326-man)	162a	Men	See Item 3 below						0	721	286
723	59	Battalion Mess Bldg	162b	SF	0	149,000	13,280	0	4,600	420	0	420	287
723	60	Battalion Admin & Supply Bldg	162c	SF	0	168,000	13,000	0	3,600	275	0	275	288
821	57	Heating Plant	162d	BTU	0	106 mil	10 mil	0	1,500	147	0	147	289
724	137	Bachelor Officers Quarters (Female)	163	Spaces	120	865	80	0	8,700	822	0	822	131
722	3	EM Barracks w/o Mess - Medical Detach	165	Men	6,027	17,810	978	0	35,000	2,045	0	760	139
723	140	Admini-tration and Supply Bldg	166	SF	0	166,400	18,400	0	3,600	419	0	144	140
										TOTAL	0	3,289	

C2 - 162 (23 Mar 60)

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

122

Final design for the EM barracks, battalion mess building, battalion administration and supply building, and the heating plant is 90 percent complete. Design is by Tectonic Associates, Somerville, N.J.; estimated cost of design is $28,000, $15,000, $10,000, and $6,000, respectively.

Final design for the BOQ (female) is 85 percent complete. This design is by Ziegler, Childs & Paulsen, Jersey City, N.J.; estimated cost of design is $41,000.

Preliminary design for the EM barracks (medical) is 100 percent complete. This design is by Ziegler, Childs & Paulsen, Jersey City, N.J.; estimated design cost is $23,000.

Final design for the administration and supply building is 85 percent complete. This design is by Ziegler, Childs & Paulsen, Jersey City, N.J.; estimated cost of design is $8,000.

What will be done with existing spaces occupied for female BOQ facilities?

General SEEMAN. Existing quarters will be retained for mobilization uses and to house personnel other than the commissioned officer personnel.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What effect do you think the construction of these quarters will have on your difficult problem of recruiting female officers for the Army?

General SEEMAN. Certainly the provision of more permanent facilities improves the morale and the attractiveness of the service to officer personnel. This is a trend in that direction. Also involved in these female BOQ's, I believe, is the desire to be in proximity to the new hospital and to be able to accommodate nurses. We have both the female personnel of the Women's Army Corps as well as the Nurse Corps involved here.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see in the latter part of the justification, pages 163 and 164, your statement having to do with that problem, which motivated my question.

Has action ever been taken by the Appropriations Committees of the Congress and by the Congress as far as funding these quarters in a prior year?

General SEEMAN. Funds were denied from the military construction appropriation bill, 1959.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What will be done with existing facilities occupied for enlisted men's barracks which you wish to replace in this program?

General SEEMAN. The facilities presently being used will be occupied by personnel of the eight new basic combat training companies. This applies to enlisted men's barracks and the medical detachment which, as indicated on page 165, are to be constructed in proximity to the new hospital. Fort Dix, as you know, is one of our most intensely utilized training centers. It is the major and only training center per se in the First Army area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the annual cost of the transportation of personnel from the present location to the new hospital site, and how long would it take to amortize the cost of these new barracks based on the savings?

General SEEMAN. Colonel Hastings, have you a statement on that?

Colonel HASTINGS. Yes, sir. The estimated annual cost of transportation of personnel to and from the new hospital site is $63,000, sir. The amortization period considering the cost of the line item would be slightly over 10 years.

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

SECOND ARMY

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now, with respect to the Second Army, please insert page 168 in the record.

(The page follows:)

[In thousands of dollars]

	Prior authorization	Proposed authorization	Proposed funding
2d Army	4,516	7,660	12,176
Fort Knox, Ky	421	6,872	7,293
Fort George G. Meade, Md	4,095	788	4,883
Fort Ritchie, Md	0	(1)	0

[1] Capehart housing only.

FORT GEORGE G. MEADE, MD.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The first item is Fort Meade.

DATE 1 Mar 1960
DEPARTMENT ARMY
FISCAL YEAR 1961
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Fort George G. Meade	Maryland	Permanent	Md-7
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Baltimore, 18 miles N	Anne Arundel	Second U.S. Army	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Troop Training and Logistical Support		1917	Active

II - MISSION

To train and logistically support Post Troop units as well as Headquarters, 2nd U.S. Army Headquarters, National Security Agency, Finance and Accounting Office, 2nd Anti-Aircraft Regional Command, U.S. Army Signal Air Defense Engineering Agency, 2nd U.S. Army Field Maintenance, Reserve Components and Reserve Officers Training Corps Summer Training.

*One time cost for easement.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	1930	9987	9866		15,011
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	2130	11112	10614		23,856

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	13,554	$ 1,150,302	$ 78,042,818	$ 79,193,120
2. LEASED	49	($ 3,455*)		$ 3,455
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959 (Except Land Rent)				$ 79,196,575
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 11,885,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 788,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 72,710,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 164,579,575

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 June 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
113	93	Access Apron (FW & RW)	182	SY	-0-	27,250	14,500	12,750	554	240	314	314
211	92	Hangar w/Shops	183	SF	-0-	42,532	21,266	21,266	871	397	474	474
711	845.200	400 Family Quarters (Capehart)	185	FAM	2,753	2,252	-0-	400	-	-	-	-
										TOTAL	788	788

(Continued)

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (Continued)

INSTALLATION NAME: Fort George G. Meade, Maryland

DATE: 1 Mar 1960

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO.	LINE ITEM NO.	DESCRIPTION	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO.	UNIT OF MEASURE	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30 Jun 59	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30Jun 59	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l	m
		Prior Authorization										
		P.L. 86/149										
530	74	Medical Laboratory	187	SF	0	34,750	34,750	0	1,251	1,251	0	1,251
811	17	Emergency Power Plant (NSA)	192	KVA					2,168	2,168	0	2,168
										SUB-TOTAL	0	3,317
		P.L. 85/685										
179	133	Trainfire I Range	193	DIR	-	LS	-	0	783	783	0	383
		P.L. 84/161										
740	10	Regimental Chapel	194	SF	5,154	48,395	9,000	0	1,500	293	0	293
										TOTAL	788	4,883

DA FORM 1674e-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE

161

126

Pre
perce
estim
Pre
desig
cost
De
Pre
desig
cost.
Fi
by t

Th
year
studi
what
appr
G
C
this
C
surv
with
proj
cons
The
sion
trai
adv
cons

C
M
C
M
(
Th
of
For
ble
ingi
Th
mec
spu
str

M
use
C
in
the

Preliminary design for the access apron and the hangar with shops is 100 percent complete. This design is by the district enginer, Baltimore, Md.; estimated cost of design $16,000 and $22,000, respectively.

Preliminary design for the medical laboratory is 80 percent complete. This design is by Faulkner, Kingsbury, and Stenhouse, Washington, D.C.; estimated cost of design, $65,000.

Design for the emergency power facility has not been started.

Preliminary design for the Trainfire I Range is 100 percent complete. This design is by Maryland Survey & Engineering Co., Baltimore, Md.; estimated cost, $19,000.

Final design for the regimental chapel is 95 percent complete. This design is by the district engineer, Baltimore, Md.; estimated cost of design, $15,000.

The Congress discussed this medical laboratory at some length last year and eliminated it from the funding program. What specific restudy has been made of this facility since that time, by whom, during what dates, and when was the report filed, with whom, and who approved it?

General SEEMAN. This refers to the medical laboratory on page 187.

Colonel HASTINGS. We have Colonel Blumberg as an expert on this.

Colonel BLUMBERG. The requirements for the laboratory have been surveyed again by the Office of the Surgeon General in cooperation with the Navy and Air Force. It has been proposed as a priority project for the Army program in order of importance with other construction items which have been planned for the Medical Service. The Surgeon General in reviewing the work of the laboratory, its mission, its function, the part that it is playing now and in the future in training and service to the troops of 2d Army area, has deemed it advisable to continue strong efforts to have a new laboratory facility constructed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There has been a restudy made?

Colonel BLUMBERG. Yes, sir; there has been.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are you familiar enough with the program to answer the question here completely, or do you wish to answer the balance of the question later, which has to do with the time which was consumed, to whom the report was made, what dates, and so forth? Do you have those reports, or do you wish to provide that?

Colonel BLUMBERG. We can provide that for the record later.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You may do so.

(The information requested follows:)

The chief pathology and laboratory consultant, OTSG, DA, during the period of November 15–30, 1959, worked with his counterparts in the Navy and Air Force to determine the availability of federally controlled laboratory space capable of housing the 2d U.S. Army Medical Laboratory in the Richmond-Washington-Baltimore area. The results were negative.

The possible use of existing permanent-type buildings for conversion to a medical laboratory was not considered feasible due to a unit cost of $20.75 per square foot for conversion versus a unit cost of $31.50 per square foot for a structure designed and constructed as a medical laboratory.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What will be done with the existing facilities in use for this laboratory work?

Colonel BLUMBERG. The existing facilities are old wood structures in the form of a messhall in poor state of repair. As far as I know, they are not suitable for any use.

DA FORM 1674a-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, at the present time the buildings are of such character you cannot use them for other operations?

Colonel BLUMBERG. No, sir.

General SEEMAN. According to our information, the buildings are temporary structures of the Civilian Conservation Corps era. Obviously, any extensive repair and rehabilitation of these would be uneconomical and useless. Whether or not the post will have some very marginal use for these when they provide better facilities for the laboratory is not specifically known.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have you checked this out to see whether these requirements could be performed by other governmental or private facilities or institution?

Colonel BLUMBERG. Yes, sir; this has been done, and there are no other facilities available.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How does the space in the present facilities compare with the total space in the new facility?

Colonel BLUMBERG. The present facilities, quoting from memory, are approximately 12,000 square feet, and the new facilities will be 34,000 square feet.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why do you need air conditioning in this facility?

Colonel BLUMBERG. Because of the type of work that is done there, utilization of animals, which requires controlled temperatures and humidity and the type of chemistry which is done can be affected by extreme heat.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the reason for the increase in the emergency power cost from $879,000 last year to $2,168,000 this year?

General SEEMAN. This refers to the NSA requirement, sir. It has a classified sheet, page 4. You will remember, sir, that last year we based our presentation to you on the availability, as I recall it, of a Navy railroad powerplant. Essentially the facility was to provide a building to run in and hook up, and all the switch gear necessary for this. In working this out throughout the year, this Navy plant has been found to be no longer available. This is the basis of our presentation this year. In other words, it requires the full structure as well as the actual standby diesel engine-driven generators and switch gear complete.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has a thorough A. & E. job been done on this figure of $2,168,000?

Mr. NORWOOD. The A. & E. has not been selected yet, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. On what basis did you get your cost factor?

Mr. NORWOOD. The cost is estimated by the Office of the Chief of Engineers, Mr. Chairman, based on stated requirements for this generator.

General SEEMAN. It is essentially on a square-foot basis, Mr. Chairman, as indicated on page 5 of our classified book. So much unit cost for the diesel generator. On the building space, for example, it is $21.90 a square foot for the 3,125-kilovolt-ampere generator house; $36 a square foot for the building and facilities to house the 625-kilovolt-ampere generator.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How modern is your index on off-the-shelf items such as generators? How modern is your pricing concept or index?

Mr. NORWOOD. It is current, based on information we now have on the purchase of generators for the NIKE program, the HERCULES program, and the ZEUS program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then they are modern and up to date?

Mr. NORWOOD. Yes, sir. They just have not been designed and put together and the details taken off the materials.

(Off the record.)

General SEEMAN. I should invite to your attention, sir, that this requires a companion deficiency authorization. The previous authorization would have been insufficient to come before you and request an appropriation. So before Mr. Vinson's committee we asked for a deficiency authorization which the whole House has approved, which is the difference between last year's $879,000 estimate and this year's $2,168,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Sanders advises me it is in the 1961 authorization.

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir; the deficiency is included there.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would prepare for the committee the power requirements last year and this year for the purpose of clarifying the record, if you will, please.

General SEEMAN. We will do so. It is my understanding that the amount of power is exactly the same. It is solely the availability of the plant as predicated last year by the Department of Defense, has now proven unavailable.

(The information requested follows:)

The power requirements for standby power for the NSA for 1960 and for 1961 remain the same.

Additional information is classified and will be provided the committee separately.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have you any idea what the cost of private industry supplying the power for this purpose would be?

General SEEMAN. No, sir; we have no comparable figures. This is essentially a standby plant. It is not an efficient central plant.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is purely a standby proposition?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir. It is a requirement because of, first, the heat generated from their electronic equipment and, second, the grave danger in case of a power outage without being able to pull in this standby plant quickly, not only with regard to the heat generated and the air conditioning, but the rebalancing of all the equipment if it is out for a period of time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What consideration has been given to having some, if not a large portion, of this communications work handled at another location of a more secure nature?

General SEEMAN. This is still referring to the NSA item?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

General SEEMAN. I think we probably should go off the record for a minute, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right.

(Off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the present power service to this facility?

General SEEMAN. It is tied into the net.

Mr. NORWOOD. It is all connected, sir.

General SEEMAN. As I recall, there were two lines in, two separate circuits in, but they were on the same pole line.

Mr. NORWOOD. That is what would happen if we got an alternate circuit.

General SEEMAN. It would come on the same right-of-way, on the same pole line, which, from the standpoint of a windstorm or an outage of some nature, would not give you the extra standby that you were buying.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you had a loop but you did not have a loop because one was subservient to the other.

General SEEMAN. That is right.

Colonel EVANS. Both of the companies operate on the same power grid, too.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That presents a rather interesting situation. How did it get there in the first place? Whose engineering technique was that?

Colonel EVANS. I think it was just a commercial situation. I do not know how they got dualed up that way. There are two commercial interests involved.

General SEEMAN. The chairman's question is, How did the Department of Defense select this site for the National Security Agency?

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have that aspect, and you also have the dual hookups coming in because wherever you are using a loop system of any character for standby purposes you base one primary existence on another primary existence. When you tie them into one unit, it is not a very good power source for standby purposes. It could have happened because of previous utilization within that area in which there was a conjunctive operation between the two. You say there are two companies involved here? Is that it?

General SEEMAN. Are there two separate companies or two separate circuits?

Mr. NORWOOD. The Maryland Gas-Electric Co. serves the facility now. We could have had another line come from Potomac Electric Power Co. in Washington. They are all integrated and get their supply essentially from the same source. So our problem here was to have an independent source we could fall back on if we had to go to self-produced power.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This is to clear that situation up. Is that it?

Mr. NORWOOD. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the reason for the increase in cost for the chapel above the one approved by the committee last year, and why the change for air conditioning, and expanding from 8,130 square feet to 9,000 square feet at $1.75 per square foot increase in what is considered an already high unit cost?

General SEEMAN. Mr. Norwood.

Mr. NORWOOD. I do not have that with me, sir. I do not have the reasons at the moment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will you get the answer?

General SEEMAN. We will provide that for the record.

(The information requested follows:)

The increase in allowable gross area from 8,130 to 9,000 square feet has been made to provide adequate space for air-conditioning equipment. The cost estimate has been increased from $26.50 to $27.75 per square foot. This increase reflects the rising trend in construction costs.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When are we going to plan chapels which can be constructed within the cost which has been presented to the Congress,

instead of finding later on that the cost of the chapels seems to be continuously escalated? What is the problem connected with this?

General SEEMAN. This is the standard plan, sir. It could only be an unusual site condition or an unusual connection with the utility.

Mr. WESTENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, at a chaplain's conference recently, it was pointed out that these things tend to increase in the requirement of religious education facilities as differentiated from chapel seats. Therefore, we may have a 300-seat chapel in one area with considerable religious education requirements for children, which will exceed the square feet you would have in other installations where you would also have a 300-seat chapel.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that assumption not pretty much basic on all of them? You do have a floating population on the bases, or at least that has been the history of the situation.

Mr. WESTENBERGER. Yes, sir; although a base might have several chapels, a chapel in the troop area, a chapel in the dependent housing area. The requirements for religious education facilities differ greatly in the two areas.

FORT RITCHIE, MD.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is Fort Ritchie.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Fort Ritchie	Maryland	Permanent	Md-8
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Waynesboro, 8 miles NW	Washington	Second U. S. Army	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Classified		1951	Active

II - MISSION

Provide for command, operations, training, administration, security, supply and other services for units and activities located at Fort Ritchie.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	67	766	199		1032
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	69	848	229		1146

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	634	$ 66,330	$ 4,311,317	$ 4,377,647
2. LEASED	1	($ 0)		$ 0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF (Except Land Rent)				$ 4,377,647
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 863,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 0
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 3,532,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 8,772,647

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDS 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
711	845.300	60 Family Quarters (Capehart)	196	FAM	122	176	27	60	-	-	-	-

195

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

General SEEMAN. In the unclassified section, Mr. Chairman, we just have a Capehart family quarters unit. In the classified section we do have a substantial item.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will you utilize the same design that you have already in existence here?

General SEEMAN. For the Capehart quarters, yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You will not have to go out and expend A. & E. money because you have plans available based upon previous operations and expenditures?

General SEEMAN. We have plans. They are spotted on the master plan. Solely for site adaptation and extension of utilities. Of course, the extension of utilities, as you know, we do under the general authorization.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are going to use the same plans. That question is clear.

What I am getting at is that you have a limit of $16,500.

General SEEMAN. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you already have your plans and you have bought and paid for them and will use them, that obviously leaves you money to go ahead and take care of what? You have a difference here in the type of material, and you have available funds to include various and sundry things which are attributes thereto. That is fine. In other words, you have your design. You pick up the design money and can apply it to take care of the limitations in the construction of it.

General SEEMAN. You will solely have to balance out the number of two- and three-bedroom units and the number of noncoms and officer quarters to fit what is approved. That is the main problem.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The only revision you would have to make to the present plans is the common denominator of the rooms versus what your plans previously called for.

General SEEMAN. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That would be the only difference involved, is that it?

General SEEMAN. That is correct.

THIRD ARMY

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall take up now the 3d Army.

Please place page 1980, the justifications in the record.

(The page follows:)

[In thousands of dollars]

	Prior authorization	Proposed authorization	Proposed funding
3d Army	4,462	7,680	12,142
Fort Benning, Ga	586	1,956	2,542
Fort Bragg, N.C	479	1,092	1,571
Fort Campbell, Ky	2,814	609	3,423
Fort McClellan, Ala	0	463	463
Fort Rucker, Ala	583	3,560	4,143

FORT BENNING, GA., ALA., AND FLA.

The first item is Fort Benning, Ga.

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Fort Benning	Georgia - Alabama - Florida	Permanent	Ala-1, Ga-5&15, Fla-5
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental) COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Columbus, 8 miles NW	Muscogee, Chattahoochee & Marion, Ga; Russell, Alabama; and Okaloosa, Florida	Third U.S. Army	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Training		1919	Active

II - MISSION

Development of leadership in all ranks; instruction of Infantry Officers in standardized techniques and tactics; training of Officers for staff duty (up to and including Regimental Combat Team); instructing, testing, qualifying enlisted men and Officers in Airborne technique and tactics. To furnish administrative and logistical support to an Infantry Division.

*Includes $1,400 one time cost for easement.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	3431	25,490	3078		31,999
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	5605	26,262	3432		35,299

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	182,154	$ 4,947,733	$ 131,697,926	$ 136,645,659
2. LEASED	319	($ 4,250*)		$ 1,400
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 Jun 1959			(Except Land Rent)	$ 136,647,059
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 6,438,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 1,956,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 117,007,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 262,048,059

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)				
CATEGORY CODE NO.	LINE ITEM NO.	DESCRIPTION	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO.	UNIT OF MEASURE	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30 Jun 59	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30 Jun 59	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED	
a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l	m	
171	51	4 Bn Headquarters & Classroom Buildings	201	SF	75,180	71,220	0	24,400	1,600	0	552	552	153
540	167	Dispensary & Dental Clinic	202	SF	21,250	43,203	0	12,500	1,300	0	384	384	154
610	22	2 Regimental Headquarters Buildings	203	SF	9,215	47,251	0	18,822	940	0	375	375	152
740	31	Regimental Gym	204	SF	15,840	107,160	0	20,500	2,000	0	365	365	196
740	55	Regimental Chapel (300 - seats)	205	SF	8,159	40,621	0	9,000	1,300	0	280	280	197
										SUB-TOTAL	1,956	1,956	
										(cont'd)			

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (Continued)

DATE

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE. 190 (cont'd)

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (Continued)

INSTALLATION NAME: Fort Benning

DATE: 1 Mar 60

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30 June 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
		Prior Authorization										
		P.L. 85/685										
722	143	EM Barracks, 263-Man, w/o Mess (Medical)	206	Man	17,602	2,917	263	0	5,900	586	0	586 100
										TOTAL	1,956	2,542

DA FORM 1674a-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Design for all items is by the district engineer, Savannah, Ga. Preliminary design of the four battalion headquarters and classroom buildings is 100 percent. Estimated cost of design is $14,000.

Design for the dispensary and dental clinic has not been started. Estimated cost of design is $19,000.

Final design for the two regimental headquarters buildings is 100 percent complete at a cost of $15,000.

Preliminary design for the regimental gymnasium is 100 percent complete. Estimated cost of design is $15,000.

Preliminary design for the regimental chapel is 100 percent complete. Estimated cost of design is $10,000.

Final design for the enlisted men's barracks (medical) is 94 percent. Estimated cost of design is $23,000.

Would you insert in the record the usual information with reference to the enlisted men's barracks which Congress has had, before it denied this request?

(The information requested follows:)

This item is required to provide permanent troop housing for medical enlisted personnel required for the operation of the recently completed 500-bed permanent hospital which includes messing facilities for hospital personnel. The entirely new Houston Hill hospital site is approximately 1.5 miles east of the existing old permanent hospital on the main post. No existing structure will have to be removed. There are 469 enlisted men currently assigned to this hospital. Of this number, 244 are married and occupy family quarters. Of the 225 unmarried enlisted men, 152 are quartered in the old permanent-type enlisted men's quarters, a part of the old hospital complex. The remaining 73 are quartered in mobilization-type buildings. The existing facilities will be diverted to other approved usage to satisfy requirements of the installation construction program which have not been provided for in new permanent construction. If this item is not constructed, it will be necessary to maintain transportation service at a cost of approximately $58,000 annually.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for battalion headquarters and classroom space in the Kelly Hill area at the present time?

General SEEMAN. They are using facilities now, a portion of the permanent barracks building. This is similar to a previous situation where if battalion headquarters and classrooms are not built, they must utilize space in the barracks to provide for their administrative and training areas. Of course, this is a diversion of space which is built for another purpose.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why is it necessary to construct four buildings for this function instead of putting them all in one large building, which would have a material effect on the expenditure requirements?

General SEEMAN. They are in different locations in the battalion areas. They have eight 263-man barracks and eight 326-man barracks. They will place the battalion headquarters on the master plan where they have been in and around the barracks area. Each troop unit has comparable facilities.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What will be the distance separating them?

General SEEMAN. This will be within walking distance in the battalion area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If they are all within walking distance what would be the reason you would not construct one large building? Normally it appears to be the desire of the military to get as much concentration of their operations as they can. Sometimes it cannot be done. In an instance of this nature, it would appear on the basis of your justifications that you could use a building large enough to accom-

modate your requirements. If you did that, you obviously would cut your construction costs to a reasonable percentage. There must be some basic reason for it. Tell me, just what is the reason?

General SEEMAN. Essentially this is for unit integrity, to have each battalion have its own headquarters and supply area for the protection of its supplies and its administrative and training program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That may be a desirable thing in some aspects of it, General, but is that actually the basic economic answer to the problem? We are all working together for a common cause here, I would assume, generally speaking. There must be some basic reason for the separation. Just what is that basic reason?

General SEEMAN. It is similar to the situation over the years past when, you will recall, we had in each individual barracks building its own company mess to facilitate training. When they went out in the field, they had to fight the battle where it came, and they had to be able to take care of themselves. Now we have a battalion area with a battalion mess.

By the same token, this is to facilitate their training. Their utilities and other plants have been laid out. There probably would be a 4- or 5-percent savings if it were put under one roof.

Mr. SHEPPARD. More than that. There would be at least a 12- or 15-percent differential if it were all put in one building. With production line operations you can produce one building, even in square footage comparable to four buildings, for an average running from 8 to 12 percent less.

Mr. WESTENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, when the studies were developed in the last few years on our 326-man barracks complex, the idea was to have 2 companies in this 326-man barracks. You would have 2 of these barracks near each other, and with those 2 barracks taking care of 326 men each. With a total of four companies per battalion, you would have additionally a mess and a supply building for each battalion.

One of the basic factors involved in the study had to do with some surveys made among hotels, for instance, and the operation of messes. It was found that it was most economical to operate messes in the range of 600 to 800 men. Operational factors enter here.

In turn, when this complex was designed for master planning on installations, the mess was put in a separate building to take care of all four companies. Administration and supply was in a separate building to give it the unit integrity of a battalion where you have in this one building only the companies which are in that battalion.

If we were to go into one building for four battalions, we would have quite a large complex here growing out of that area on the post. There is not room on the master plan, generally speaking, to put such a large complex on the post where you would have the 326-man barracks, recognizing that there are 2 of them for each battalion. Here you would have a complex of a number of buildings sited appropriately, whereas you do not have room for much larger buildings in the master planned areas.

Mr. SHEPPARD. So far as not having the ground available for the building, that would be one thing. Master planning is another thing. From the psychological point of view, I might take the responsibility

to say, Why the Pentagon? Why not have 10 Pentagons? Would you care to comment upon that parallel?

Mr. WESTENBERGER. No, sir.

(Off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for dispensary and dental clinic facilities at the present time?

General SEEMAN. There are no dental facilities in this particular area. The troops presently are going to a temporary clinic 4 miles away in the Harmony Church area. With the completion of this project in this area the plan of the post is to close down the temporary clinics at Harmony Church and Sand Hill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for regimental headquarters at the present time?

General SEEMAN. This again is a case where barracks space has been diverted to provide the administrative space for the headquarters building.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for gymnasium space at the present time and how far away are other recreational facilities?

General SEEMAN. The closest existing facility for these troops—and this is the Kelly Hill area we are speaking about—is a World War II temporary structure 4 miles away in the Harmony Church area.

As you know, from a morale and recreational standpoint, as well as reduced equipment and motor vehicle use, the provision of a gymnasium in the area of the troop barracks is most efficient.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why should battalion headquarters space cost $19 a square foot and regimental headquarters space $16.50 per square foot?

General SEEMAN. I do not have the specific answer to that, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are in the same location, reinforcement steel and mortar and bricks should be the same price.

It seems to me as though something is inconsistent with the pricing requirements.

Mr. NORWOOD. It goes back to support your argument of a little earlier, that this is one building only. We acknowledge there is some saving in putting all the facilities under one roof.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Am I to understand that your explanation is that the battalion headquarters is one space only or is it more than one?

Mr. NORWOOD. Headquarters are four buildings at this square-foot cost.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Regimental headquarters are two buildings only?

Mr. NORWOOD. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask you again where you get the $2.50 differential where you have four buildings as against two buildings?

Mr. WESTENBERGER. Battalion headquarters buildings are 6,100 square feet each. Regimental headquarters are about 50 percent larger, and it comes back to your point.

Whether it would fully justify the $16.50 to $19 per square foot is not certain, but the regimental headquarters are 9,411 square feet each.

Mr. NORWOOD. These estimates are on standard plans, Mr. Chairman. They are different in nature.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I understand we are talking about brick and mortar to build a building. We are putting up a building.

Mr. NORWOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I do not quite understand the reason for the difference.

My information is that it is $19 a square foot for battalion headquarters, and the space for the regimental headquarters is $16.50 a square foot, both buildings in the same area. All price factors should be the same so far as materials are concerned. Yet there is a difference in the square-foot cost. Where is that difference?

General SEEMAN. Regimental headquarters is 50 percent larger per building.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I understand.

General SEEMAN. Second, it is two stories.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That does not change the cost of the material per square foot. You can increase the total cost factor. I will grant you that.

When it comes to a square-foot factor the price of materials comes in.

General SEEMAN. I see your point.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you have 10,000 square feet it will cost you more to put in the bricks, mortars, and whatnot than it would be for 5,000 feet, but the cost factor per square foot should be the same, about the same.

Mr. NORWOOD. Part of that difference is in the arrangement of the building itself, the numbers of partitions which are irrespective of the number of square feet.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, in your square-foot factor you should not analyze it on the materials alone?

Mr. NORWOOD. You are right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Because you have other things involved?

Mr. NORWOOD. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on this item?

Mr. JONAS. I have none.

FORT BRAGG, N.C.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next is Fort Bragg, N.C.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

FISCAL YEAR	DEPARTMENT	DATE
1961	ARMY	1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Fort Bragg	North Carolina	Permanent	26, 27, & 15
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Fayetteville, 10 miles SE	Cumberland, Hoke, Dare, Orange, Granville, Wake	Third Army	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Training		1918	Active

II - MISSION

Tactical training of an airborne division, air transportation (helicopter) units, an airborne corps headquarters (XVIII Airborne Corps) and special warfare (The Special Warfare Center). Testing of airborne material (U.S. Army Airborne and Electronics Board).

*Includes $11,211 one time cost for easement.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 Jun 59	2,657	26,396	2,376		31
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	2,564	23,646	2,167		28

IV - INVENTORY

	LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED		130,726	$ 3,921,786	$ 146,157,712	$ 150,079,198
2. LEASED		31	$ 11,211*		$ 11,211
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 Jun 59 (Except Land Rent)					$ 150,093,709
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY					$ 1,500,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST					$ 1,092,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION					$ 75,779,000
7. GRAND TOTAL					$ 228,374,709

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				OUT TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
171	201	Bn Classroom Building	209	SF	83,600	38,176	-0-	3,500	900	-0-	74	74
171	234	Bn Headquarters & Classroom Bldg	210	SF				6,100			151	151
171	236	Instr Shed & Classroom Bldg	211	SF	-0-	7,200	-0-	7,200	135	-0-	135	135
442	11	9 Battalion Storerooms	213	SF	-0-	33,800	-0-	23,400	600	-0-	456	456
740	213	Regimental Chapel (300-seat)	214	SF	12,930	102,935	-0-	9,000	3,000	-0-	276	276
										SUB-TOTAL	1,092	1,092

156 245 179 155 246

207

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE

140

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (Continued)

INSTALLATION NAME	DATE
Fort Bragg, N.C.	1 Mar 60

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				OUT TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 60 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 30 Jun 60 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 30 Jun 60 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
171	201	Bn Classroom Building	209	SF	83,600	38,176	-0-	3,500	900	-0-	74	74
171	234	Bn Headquarters & Classroom Bldg	210	SF				6,100			151	151
171	236	Instr Shed & Classroom Bldg	211	SF	-0-	7,200	-0-	7,200	135	-0-	135	135
442	11	9 Battalion Storerooms	213	SF	-0-	33,800	-0-	23,400	600	-0-	456	456
740	213	Regimental Chapel (300-seat)	214	SF	12,930	102,935	-0-	9,000	3,000	-0-	276	276
										SUB-TOTAL	1,092	1,092

208

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (Continued)

INSTALLATION NAME: Fort Bragg, N. C.

DATE: 1 Mar 60

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30June59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30June59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
		Prior Authorization										
		P.L. 85/685										
179	186	3 Trainfire I Ranges	215	DLR	0	LS	LS	0	479	479	0	479 (a)
										TOTAL	1,092	1,571

208

DA FORM 1674a-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

(See note at top of following page.)

Preliminary design for the battalion classroom building, battalion headquarters and classroom building, the instruction shed and classroom building, nine battalion storerooms, and the regimental chapel is 100 percent complete. This design is by the district engineer, Wilmington, N.C.; estimated cost of design $4,000, $6,000, $7,000, $13,000, and $8,000 respectively.

Final design for the Trainfire I ranges is 98 percent complete. This design is by Guy Hudgins, Inc.-Arthur C. Jenkins Assoc., Fayetteville, N.C.; estimated cost of design $21,000.

What are you using for battalion classroom and headquarters space now and what consideration has been given to the rehabilitation of existing buildings for this purpose?

General SEEMAN. For this purpose classes are held out of doors, weather permitting; if not they are held in the dayrooms of the existing barracks.

Of course, this is wrong because the men off duty using the dayroom do not have that facility at that particular time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When that question comes down to you straighten it out, please.

(The information requested follows:)

Permanent barracks space is being diverted for use as classrooms and headquarters. The area in question is that in which are located the newest barracks. There are no other temporary structures within 1½ to 2 miles which could be rehabilitated for use.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for battalion storerooms at the present time?

General SEEMAN. The answer is that again barracks space is being diverted for this storeroom purpose and troops thus dispossessed are being housed in temporary barracks.

Mr. JONAS. You say there are no permanent buildings anywhere at Fort Bragg which can be used for battalion classrooms. Have you not had any battalion classroom facilities there at any time in the past?

General SEEMAN. No, sir. There is a combination of factors involved here. Location, and their proximity to the barracks areas of the troops is one consideration. Second there is the fact that they have used temporary space in the permanent barracks for this purpose.

In the particular storeroom item on page 213 which the chairman mentioned there are available mobilization-type barracks, 2¼ miles away from this permanent barracks area.

Mr. JONAS. What you mean to say, is it not, is that there are no facilities easily accessible to the battalion area? Fort Bragg is a permanent station and has been there for many, many years. I just cannot imagine there has been no classroom space available for battalion instruction down through the years.

General SEEMAN. That is correct, sir. The barracks for this classroom were constructed in the 1956 program. They did not have any of this——

Mr. JONAS. What you mean is that you built new barracks to house a battalion in a battalion area?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. Now you want a classroom in that area?

General SEEMAN. That is right, sir, to facilitate their training.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why is it necessary to build nine different buildings instead of one large building? I ask to get at the cost factor.

General SEEMAN. That is to fit the organization there, sir. These are for units above the company level; specifically, three combat groups four battalions of the airborne division, a tank battalion, and a battalion of the 16th Artillery.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There are two approaches to this problem as I see it. You have a number of different functions to perform. If we go to the construction cost factors alone nobody would argue that you can build one building for less than nine. Obviously the dispersement of the buildings is an important one insofar as operational requirements is concerned. Is that the answer to this problem?

General SEEMAN. Let me go back a moment, sir. As you know, this airborne corps is the No. 1 fire engine service. It is true that from a pure standpoint of efficiency, the cost of taking care of so many tons or so many square feet, that you should centralize it, but these units are ready on an hour's notice.

If you had a large area—well, it could be worked out and you could plan a system—but the system has been that you approach it on a company and battalion level for fixing the responsibility and saving them from all standing in line behind the same assembly line operation and figure it on a dollar efficiency basis.

This is the same answer we have given before. We have had experts talking about warehouse space countrywide. We are not in the business of merely putting roofs over the heads of people. They have to be in the right place to fit in with the current requirement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In this instance the actual operational requirements are predicated on two things:

First, you are bringing your operations into certain command levels for military reasons, to facilitate your requirements?

General SEEMAN. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In order to change that and consolidate your operation it would seem you would have to make many changes; is that correct?

General SEEMAN. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There would be a tremendous amount of change involved?

General SEEMAN. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the analysis you have made of this situation you feel that by and between the cost factors and the operational requirements it is more expeditious to approach it on a separate building complex than it is to take it in toto?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir, in this place where you are involved with human bodies as opposed to so many tons and items of inert materials.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. WESTENBERGER. When the study was made regarding the need for battalion storerooms, consideration was given to storing these things in the company storerooms which are in our battalion supply buildings.

The major problem confronting us had to do with maneuverability of the troops and their trucks, vehicles, and so on, for loading.

It was not possible to have loading ramps and have all these companies trying to get trucks loaded in and out and trying to get on airlift which is involved here and be on their way.

It was, therefore, necessary to have paratroopers, for example, get their equipment over in the battalion storeroom of their own, for instance, where trucks could come in, get it loaded and be on their way. It had to do with maneuverability.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would you offer the same parallel insofar as handling bodies as you would with supplies? Do you use the same logic?

Mr. WESTENBERGER. This is the logic used, sir.

General SEEMAN. It is a problem of command and expeditious control of individuals and responsibility for troop units as well as their equipment. It does no good to send 100 bodies if they do not have their guns and ammunition which they are trained to handle.

Mr. JONAS. Do you put the equipment of the individual men in this battalion and storage room?

General SEEMAN. No, sir; they are responsible for their own individual equipment, but their team weapons are handled here.

Mr. JONAS. How many companies will use this storeroom?

General SEEMAN. These are per battalion so there will be four companies.

Mr. JONAS. You have a building about 40 by 60. You will have to build partitions in there and let one cubbyhole serve each company?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. You will not have enough room in there. You will have to take them one at a time and empty one cubbyhole at a time. That is not much space for $50,000.

Mr. WESTENBERGER. This is per building, there are nine buildings, and the total square footage is 23,400.

Mr. JONAS. I thought you had a storehouse for each battalion.

Mr. WESTENBERGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. I refer to one storehouse for one battalion of four companies. Each storehouse has only 2,300 square feet. That is a building 50 or 60 by 40, which is a small storage space, is it not, for four companies of men?

Mr. WESTENBERGER. The supply buildings are elsewhere in the program and they are broken out into four partitions like that.

Here, however, there is a battalion set of equipment and supplies. There is no need to break this down into four bins, we will say.

Mr. JONAS. You have weapons not handled on a battalion basis but a company basis?

Mr. WESTENBERGER. That is right.

Mr. JONAS. You cannot mix the weapons of A, B, C, and D Company all together. You have to keep them separately, do you not?

Mr. WESTENBERGER. The man keeps his weapons in the——

Mr. JONAS. I do not refer to the individual rifle but the company weapons.

Mr. WESTENBERGER. That is an entirely separate building from this one. We have a battalion administration and supply building which covers the four companies and the equipment of those companies.

We have a battalion storeroom covering the battalion headquarters. You have certain radios, communications equipment, and so on.

Mr. JONAS. The equipment in these storehouses would be equipment used by the headquarters of a battalion instead of by the individual companies.

Mr. WESTENBERGER. Yes, sir.

FORT CAMPBELL, KY.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we shall turn to Fort Campbell, Ky.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

FISCAL YEAR	DEPARTMENT	DATE
1961	ARMY	1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Fort Campbell	Kentucky - Tennessee	Permanent	Tenn 15 & 22 Ky-8 & 27
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Clarksville, 8 miles NW	Christian & Trigg, Ky; Montgomery & Stewart, Tenn.	Third U.S. Army	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Training		1942	Active

II - MISSION

Principal mission is basic and technical training of Airborne Division, Engineer Group, and other non-division units, including parachute landing (equipment and personnel) and weapons firing operations.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 Jun 59	1266	15,806	1782		18,774
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	1311	17,998	1765		20,074

IV - INVENTORY

	LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED		105,397	$ 4,505,620	$ 111,983,463	$ 116,509,102
2. LEASED			($ 29,951)		$ 29,751
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959 (Except Land Rent)					$ 116,538,853
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY					$ 8,241,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST					$ 609,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION					$ 100,003,000
7. GRAND TOTAL					$ 225,414,853

*One time cost for easement.

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY					PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)				
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m	
211	188	Addn of Shops to 2 Hangars	217	SF	-0-	33,641	13,388	20,253	752	441	311	311	159
740	149	Regimental Chapel (300-Seat)	219	SF	8,159	74,930	-0-	9,000	2,350	-0-	298	298	253
711	845.200	500 Family Quarters (Capehart)	220	FAM	2,908	2,455	-0-	500	-	-	-	-	
										SUB-TOTAL	609	609	
		Prior Authorization P. L. 86/149											
871	57	Storm Drainage		LF	0	31,775	31,775	0	2,300	2,300	0	2,300	199
		P.L. 85/685											
179	152	2 Trainfire I Range		DLR	0	15	15	0	514	514	0	514	101
					216					TOTAL	609	3,423	

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Design for all items by the district engineer, Nashville, Tenn.:
Preliminary design for addition to shops to two hangars is 90 percent complete. Estimated cost of design is $8,000.
Preliminary design for regimental chapel is 100 percent complete. Estimated cost of design is $9,000.
Preliminary design for storm drainage is 100 percent complete. Estimated cost of design is $70,000.
Preliminary design for two Trainfire I Ranges is 85 percent complete. Estimated cost of design is $16,000.

Last year Congress approved the storm drainage request. Why was it not constructed? The justification you made was of primary importance last year. It was to take care of surplus water.

You got the money for it and did not build it. What goes on?

Colonel EVANS. This is a reprogram item, sir. The Army changed its programing and budgeting procedures.

In the past we had certain items which went through the Bureau of the Budget. I refer now to the fiscal year 1959 program for construction.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right.

Colonel EVANS. Selected items were processed through the Bureau of the Budget. We did not have enough funds but did go through the apportionment procedure to get program approval. The items went 15 percent over the actual funds allowed for flexibility.

Those items were apportioned to that extent by the Bureau of the Budget; they were not presented to Congress for new funds under the existing procedure.

Under the then existing procedure we presented our requirements and realized there would be some slippage.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

General SEEMAN. We are coming in completely new on this one. It was in the overprogramed area before?

Colonel EVANS. No, sir; this was in last year's item. After the new appropriation request was granted, and where this particular line item was asked for and funded, we asked for initial apportionment. Included in that apportionment were some of these overprogramed items for which we had no items previously. There also would be items not presented to Congress for the second time last year.

We then received instructions that this procedure no longer will prevail, that our overprograming is not recognized as being a valid device for coming in to get new apportionments. If we want apportionments on those items, we will have to take it back to the committee.

I understood we were to substitute something out of the 1960 appropriations therefrom.

We have sent to Congress some $11 million of such items. We are asking for this drainage structure now because there were other items at Fort Campbell which were in the old program and for which we are asking reprograming now.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, this is one of those things that is affected by a limited budget and a priority list. As something becomes

more important and higher in your priority list you apply funds to the more important items.

Colonel EVANS. That is right, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions?

Mr. JONES. I have no questions.

FORT M'CLELLAN, ALA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next is Fort McClellan, Ala.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 60

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Fort McClellan	Alabama	Permanent	Ala-5
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental). COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Anniston, 7 miles	Calhoun	Third US Army	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Chemical Corps, WAC Training and Schools - National Guard and Reserve Summer Training		1915	Active

II - MISSION

Chemical Corps Training Command, including operation of Chemical Corps School which provides chemical, biological & radiological warfare training for troop units and selected personnel for Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

100th Group Chemical Corps, Chemical Corps Field Requirements Agency
WAC Basic Training and WAC Specialist School
National Guard and Reserve Summer Training

*One time cost for easement.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	576	3,425	936		4,937
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	252	4,635	1,163		6,750

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	41,228	$ 742,153	$ 47,929,159	$ 48,672,312
2. LEASED	4,218	($ 28*)		$ 126
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959			(Except Land Rent)	$ 48,672,438
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 3,831,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 463,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 18,272,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 71,238,438

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30Jun59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
171	1	Decontamination Equipment Building	224	SF	0	6,250	0	6,250	121	0	121	121
171	3	Chemical Equipment Building	225	SF	0	6,250	0	6,250	117	0	117	117
171	151	Air Condition - WAC School	226	DLR	0	LS	0	LS	167	0	167	167
422	134	Ammunition Magazine	227	SF	6,768	2,492	0	2,492	58	0	58	58
										TOTAL	463	463

223

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

(See note at top of following page.)

Preliminary design for the decontamination equipment building is 85 percent complete. This design is by Hofferbert & Ellis, Gadsden, Ala., estimated cost of design is $6,000.

Preliminary design for the chemical equipment building is 85 percent complete. This design is by Hofferbert & Ellis, Gadsden, Ala., estimated cost of design is $6,000.

Preliminary design for air conditioning WAC School and the ammunition magazine is 85 percent complete. This design is by the district engineer, Mobile, Ala; estimated cost of design is $6,000 and $3,000, respectively.

When was the WAC School constructed and if air-conditioning is required why was it not included at that time?

General SEEMAN. There has been more recent criteria authorized by the Department of Defense for air-conditioning and ventilating. I do not have the time when the school was actually constructed. We will provide that for the record, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

The WAC School building was constructed in calendar year 1953 and occupied in calendar year 1954.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It was undoubtedly before the criteria allowing air-conditioning within certain geographical areas.

General SEEMAN. In this zone, yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And in zones of like character?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now that you find yourseles within one of these zones you are requesting air-conditioning?

General SEEMAN. That is correct.

Further, they have a particular condition at this WAC School where it is very noisy. They conduct classroom instruction there so it puts this in a high priority.

FORT RUCKER, ALA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next, Fort Rucker, Ala.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

FISCAL YEAR	DEPARTMENT	DATE
1961	ARMY	1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO
Fort Rucker	Alabama	Permanent	11a-10 & -11
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Ozark, 10 miles N	Dale and Coffee	Third US Army	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Army Aviation Center		1942	Active

II - MISSION

The United States Army Aviation Center, including the United States Army Aviation School and supporting units; the United States Army Aviation Board; United States Army Transportation Aircraft Test and Support Activity; United States Army Signal Corps Aviation Test and Support Detachment; U.S. Army Aviation Human Research Unit; United States Army Board for Aviation Accident Research; The 2nd Battle Group 31st Infantry with the 21st Aviation Company and 7292 Aerial Combat Reconnaissance Company in direct support of the United States Aviation School; one Engineer Battalion (Heavy Construction).

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	1260	3171	1396		6,027
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	1496	7556	1316		10,368

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	58,953	$ 505,875	$ 42,202,773	$ 42,708,648
2. LEASED	1,707	$ 5,056	$	$ 0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959			(Except Land Rent)	$ 42,708,648
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 15,866,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 3,560,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 77,870,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 141,404,546

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)				
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDS 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m	
111	121	Runways FW #6	230	SY	-0-	85,070	-0-	85,070	381	-0-	381	381	125
111	15	Runways, Aux 3	231	SY	-0-	84,700	-0-	84,700	479	-0-	479	479	122
112	18	Taxiways, Aux 3	232	SY	-0-	49,600	-0-	49,600	235	-0-	235	235	123
112	124	Taxiways, FW #6	233	SY	-0-	31,021	-0-	31,021	205	-0-	205	205	126
113	123	Parking Apron & Facilities, Aux #3	234	SY	-0-	65,650	-0-	65,650	447	-0-	447	447	124
124	103	Fuel Storage, Auxiliary 3	235	GAL	-0-	60,000	-0-	24,000	160	-0-	67	67	120
136	105	Airfield Pavement Lighting, Aux 3	236	LF	-0-	19,000	-0-	19,000	285	-0-	285	285	121
					228								

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (Continued)

INSTALLATION NAME: Fort Rucker, Alabama

DATE: 1 Mar 1960

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)				
CATEGORY CODE NO.	LINE ITEM NO.	DESCRIPTION	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO.	UNIT OF MEASURE	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30 Jun 59	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30 Jun 59	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED	
a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l	m	
141	102	Operations Building w/Control Tower, Aux 3	237	SF	-0-	5,600	-0-	5,600	192	-0-	192	192	116
171	122	Operations Building, FW #6	238	SF	-0-	1,000	-0-	1,000	59	-0-	59	59	127
171	126	Flight Instructors Building, Aux #3	239	SF	-0-	12,600	-0-	12,600	204	-0-	204	204	118
211	104	2 Post Flight Maint Hangars, Aux 3	241	SF	-0-	16,800	-0-	16,800	189	-0-	189	189	104
211	115	Erect Hangar w/Shops (TATSA)	243	SF	36,288	36,288	-0-	36,288	394	-0-	394	394	254
730	125	Fire & Rescue Station, Aux 3	244	SF	-0-	2,764	-0-	2,764	59	-0-	59	59	117
911	2	Land Acquisition, Aux 3	245	AC	-0-	360	-0-	360	30	-0-	80	80	105
911	120	Land Acquisition, FW 6	247	AC	-0-	265	-0-	265	12	-0-	12	12	106
932	127	Site Utils, Roads, Pkg, & Lands, Aux #3	249	DLR	-0-	LS	-0-	LS	272	-0-	272	272	119
711	845.400	498 Family Quarters (Capehart)	250	FAM	1,316	2,144	-0-	498	-	--	--	—	
										SUB-TOTAL	3,560	3,560	
		Prior Authorization P.L. 85/056											
171	80	Laboratory Classroom Building		CF	0	5,000	5,000	0	159	159	0	159	103
171	79	Academic Building		SF	0	15,240	15,240	0	4,300	424	0	424	170
										TOTAL	3,560	4,143	

229

DA FORM 1674e-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE

Preliminary design of the following items by the district engineer, Mobile, Ala:

	Percent complete	Estimated design cost
Runways FW No. 6	100	$20,000
Runways auxiliary No. 3	90	24,000
Taxiways auxiliary No. 3	90	12,000
Taxiways FW No. 6	100	10,000
Parking apron and facilities auxiliary No. 3	90	23,000
Fuel storage, auxiliary No. 3	90	3,000
Airfield pavement lighting auxiliary No. 3	50	14,000
Operations building with control tower, auxiliary No. 3	90	9,000
Operations building, auxiliary No. 3	75	3,000
Flight instructors building, auxiliary No. 3	100	10,000
2 post flight maintenance hangars, auxiliary No. 3	100	10,000

Preliminary design for the item, for erect hangar with shops (TATSA) is 100 percent complete. This design is by Joseph Donofro, Dothan, Ala.; estimated design cost is $19,000.

Preliminary design for the fire and rescue station, auxiliary No. 3, is 100 percent complete. This design is by the district engineer, Mobile, Ala.; estimated cost of design is $3,000.

Preliminary design for site utilities, roads, parking, auxiliary No. 3, is 50 percent complete. This design is by the district engineer, Mobile, Ala.; estimated cost of design is $13,000.

Final design for the laboratory classroom and the academic building is 90 percent complete. This design is by Platt, Roberts & Co., Mobile, Ala.; estimated cost of design is $8,000 and $21,000, respectively.

What restudy have you made of the need for academic facilities at this location since you were last before the committee? When was this made and by whom? Also, with whom was the report for final action filed?

General SEEMAN. The requirements for the Army aviation emanate from Fort Rucker, which is the Aviation Training Center. They may emanate from their master plan, post planning board studies, and they may emanate also from the flying safety requirements.

They are presented to the 3d Army, the Continental Army Command, and the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations in the Army Staff. They come to us from them.

I do not think there is any specific study. This is a process which goes on the year long.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, there was no specific study?

General SEEMAN. That is right. As you can see here, sir, this is still part of the consolidation, centralization, and the more efficient conduct of our training activities at Fort Rucker.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Air Force is closing flying facilities all over the country and it is contemplated they will do more of this in the future. What consideration have you given to transferring at least a portion of the workload from Fort Rucker to one of these locations?

General SEEMAN. There was no Air Force location available at the time we started on the Fort Rucker consolidation. I do not know of any right now which have been mentioned.

Of course, the training which is given after you pass the basic flying training, the training given to the Army aviators is with short fields—I have a sketch here of the number of sod fields in this area where they are trained to land and take off as part of their training——

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, small auxiliary fields?

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

General SEEMAN. Just strips, either for helicopters or light planes to get in and out of small areas with very limited facilities. This is part of the essential training of the Army aviator.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will this complete the air operation requirement at this installation? If not, what remains to be done?

General SEEMAN. No, sir. Their master plan extends into the future. The estimated future authorization for Fort Rucker, as shown on form 1674, is $77 million.

The present inventory plant is for $44 million in round numbers. That is the acquisition value.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What type of civilian contractor operation do you have at this location?

General SEEMAN. This is a basic training civilian contract where the contractor is provided certain Government-furnished facilities. Then he undertakes the management of the basic training as well as the basic maintenance of the equipment.

After the basic course, the Army takes up its own tactical and other training, advanced type of training.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What type of contract is issued in circumstances of this character?

Colonel MOORE. I do not know what type of contract this would be.

General SEEMAN. I would purely speculate and provide the answer for the record. I would speculate it was probably time and material at so much per head and so much per hour, but to a certain extent estimated on number of students per given period of time and what we call a unit-type contract.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Tell us a little more about that.

(The information requested follows:)

The type contract issued is a negotiated fixed-price contract.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why cannot the transportation test support facility functions be handled at other locations or by private industry?

General SEEMAN. There was quite a discussion among the Army staff as to the need of the transportation support facility here. The Transportation Corps, sir, as you know, has the research and development and the procurement responsibility for Army aircraft.

As to their development plans and their testing of prototypes and other models during the course of this work, the requirements of the field command must be met. This is the basis on which it was decided they ought to have this facility in the proximity of the centralized flying training at Fort Rucker.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What items in this program are contingent upon the land acquisition items? At the same time what is the basis for your land cost and do you anticipate any difficulties in securing this land?

General SEEMAN. The basis for the land cost, sir, is a real estate planning report made by the real estate service of the mobile district engineer.

The two items of land acquisition are vital to most of the other items. I think one involves auxiliary field No. 3. All the other items for auxiliary No. 3 are dependent on that land acquisition.

Here again the two sites are auxiliary fields in proximity to this area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are you going to retain these other little fields and maintain them to any degree?

If the present request is allowed for concentration of operations, and that is what it is, will you still have anything to do with these outlying satellite landing spots?

General SEEMAN. These are not owned, sir. They go into them on the basis of renting a right to land periodically at that point.

They are sod fields, with no permanent construction there.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You still intend to use them as auxiliary fields?

General SEEMAN. As small training fields.

The main field on the base, and it was a takeover from a World War II field, is Cairns Field plus one other.

These auxiliary fields are tied into the training operations.

Mr. JONAS. It is not a question of crosswinds, is it?

General SEEMAN. No.

Mr. JONAS. This is just for safety?

General SEEMAN. For safety and for training.

Mr. JONAS. They justified Meridian on the basis of crosswinds. I know it is a different type of field but it is a training field for the Navy.

General SEEMAN. They have their main runway alined with the prevailing wind and then there will be a storm runway for the next major——

Mr. SHEPPARD. But these satellite fields are used in the training program.

In the training program the flier practices setdowns and takeoffs.

General SEEMAN. The basic training, just to get to flying the airplane, is done with the instructor close. When he is advanced he is sent out on a tactical mission to go and bring back a report or go and do this, that, and the other thing, observe and come back, or if he is a helicopter pilot to go and pick up casualties or something at a site as near as possible to a battle situation. That is why these little odds and ends of strips are scattered throughout the county.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for laboratory classroom and academic space at the present time and what will be done with these facilities if the funding requested in this budget is granted?

General SEEMAN. They are undoubtedly using certain space in the open, and I see they do not have any temporary buildings they are using for this particular purpose. In the event of inclement weather they are taught these subjects in classrooms utilizing schematic diagrams. Apparently they wish a more permanent mockup for their training purposes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You state in your justifications that the Army Aviation School is in the process of reevaluating classroom requirements. When was this reevaluation started and when will it be completed?

General SEEMAN. As I mentioned before, it is a continuous process, and part of the problem is to make some readjustment after they acquire this construction in this area.

When they secure auxiliary field No. 3 they will transpose a certain type of instruction which is carried on on the other bases, so there will be a readjustment of all the functions, both classroom and maintenance training as well as operational training.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I note in your justification the following:

The U.S. Aviation School is in the process of reevaluating classroom requirements.

That indicates you have not yet established them. You are asking for funds on something which is indefinite.

General SEEMAN. The total requirement at the present time is for 23 classrooms based upon current student loads. We expect to start this construction in increments on a priority basis between the general academic area and the maintenance instruction area.

The eventual requirements are as stated in the first sentence, sir, at 58. Our present increment is——

Mr. SHEPPARD. The question is whether you are reevaluating the 23-classroom requirement.

General SEEMAN. We are reevaluating the number of classes per year, various courses, basic and advance courses, fixed wing and rotary wing, and the total load so we do have a properly thought-out plan.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When do you consider you will have the reevaluation of the classroom requirements made more definite? When will it be absolutely known?

General SEEMAN. I would say certainly within the next year because there is no great expansion or contraction in process that I know of at this time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions?

Mr. JONAS. You are buying two tracts of land, one 265 acres, at $45.30 an acre. That sounds pretty reasonable to me.

However, you will pay $225 an acre for 360 acres of open farmland at another place. Apparently that land is not going begging down there at that price per acre. That is a pretty high price for land when you consider the type of land it is.

How did you arrive at those values?

General SEEMAN. They are based upon actual real estate planning report where they have gone out and studied——

Mr. JONAS. Do you have options at those figures or are these estimates?

General Seeman. I would not at this time say we had an option. Normally we would not.

One is in the vicinity of one of the smaller towns.

Mr. JONAS. One is 4 miles from Enterprise and the other is 6 miles from Brantley. That must be pretty good land.

General SEEMAN. It is based upon actual current sales as recorded in the courthouse and an appraisal of the area.

Mr. JONAS. Do you buy this land by negotiation or by condemnation?

General SEEMAN. By negotiation if it is within reasonable limits. We will resort to condemnation, first, if we cannot reach an agreement; second, if there is a cloud on the title where you go into a friendly condemnation before the court to determine past title.

Mr. JONAS. I did not think open farmland would be that costly.

General SEEMAN. Land is emotional. It depends on how deep their roots are.

Mr. JONAS. I notice another thing which is worthy of mention here.

In these runways and in your taxiways you must have picked out

some pretty rugged terrain on which to locate these runways. For example, I notice on the first one, page 230, you will spend $381,000, $150,000 of which is for excavation, $39,000 for clearing, $48,000 for drainage, and that same situation obtains throughout all of your locations.

General SEEMAN. That is right.

Mr. JONAS. You have several examples shown here for taxiways, $235,000, for which $129,000 is for excavation and $29,000 for drainage.

General SEEMAN. Actually, oversimplying it, it amounts to the fact that our unit cost is just the cost of frosting on the cake. The runway surface is the very last——

Mr. JONAS. Is this mountainous territory?

General SEEMAN. No, sir, rolling area, wooded land, and open land in southeastern Alabama.

The cost as presented, unit cost of the bituminous surface, is $1.25 per square yard. That is really the smallest element of the smallest cost.

Mr. JONAS. Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

FORT BLISS, TEX.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we have Fort Bliss, Tex., on pages 257 and 258.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Fort Bliss	Texas	Permanent	Tex-1 & NM-6
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Adjacent to El Paso	El Paso, Texas & Dona Ana & Otero, N.M.	Fourth US Army	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
U.S. Army Air Defense Center		1893	Active

II - MISSION

U.S. Army Air Defense Center acts as coordinator between U.S. Army Air Defense School, 1st Guided Missile Brigade, and U.S. Army Air Defense Board in study, development, evaluation and teaching of tactical, technical, logistical and training doctrines and programs concerning Antiaircraft Artillery and Guided Missiles of interest to Commander, Continental Armies. Supervision of training of reneral reserve and Zone of Interior type units.

*Includes 365 one time cost for easement.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	2461	18,205	2512		23,178
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	3714	19,143	2390		25,247

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	1,177,610	$ 4,318,875	$ 97,176,044	$ 101,494,919
2. LEASED	131,277	($ 21,312*)		$ 73
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959 (Except Land Rent)				$ 101,494,8[illegible]
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 3[illegible],31[illegible]
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 2,026,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 143,141,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 281,092,984

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)				
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATIONS OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATIONS OUTSTANDG. 30June59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m	
212	251	Assembly & Test Equip Bldg, Hawk (SP)	259	SF	0	5,000	0	5,000	163	0	163	163	38
212	241	GM Maintenance Shop (ORO Grande) (SP)	260	SF	0	16,000	0	8,000	600	0	300	300	180
214	106	Motor Repair Shop & Facs (ORO Grande)(SP)	261	SF	0	7,000	2,000	5,000	255	109	146	146	181
228	225	Addition to Field Printing Plant	262	SF	11,544	6,000	0	6,000	134	0	134	134	91
724	6	Bachelor Officers Quarters	264	MEN	512	684	0	140	6,300	0	1 283	1,283	159
					257				SUB - TOTAL		2,026	2,026	

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

158

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (Continued)

INSTALLATION NAME

DATE

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (Continued)

INSTALLATION NAME: Fort Bliss, Texas

DATE: 1 Mar 60

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)				
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30June59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m	
		Prior Authorization											
		P.L. 85/685											
171	217	Administration and Classroom Building	265	SF	258,638	226,737	163,060	0	4,500	2,932	0	837	184
		P.L. 85/241											
740	204	Auditorium, Guided Missile Training	267	SF	0	4,000	4,000	0	106	106	0	106	182
740	203	Recreation Bldg, Guided Missile Training	268	SF	0	4,000	4,000	0	86	86	0	86	198
										SUB-TOTAL	0	192	
		P.L. 84/968											
610	14	2 Regimental Headquarters Buildings	269	SF	0	47,055	18,822	0	900	359	0	359	183
										TOTAL	2,026	3,414	

258

DA FORM 1674a-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE

(See notes on top of following page.)

Preliminary design for the assembly and test equipment building, HAWK, is 100 percent complete. This design is by Garland and Hilles, El Paso, Tex.; estimated cost of design $8,000.

Design has not been started on the GM maintenance shop, the motor repair shop and facilities, and the addition to the field printing plant. Estimated cost of design is $15,000, $7,000, and $7,000 respectively.

Preliminary design of the BOQ is 5 percent complete. This design is by the district engineer, Albequerque, N. Mex.; estimated cost of design $40,000.

Preliminary design for the administration and classroom building is 100 percent complete. This design is by Carroll and Doeble, El Paso, Tex.; estimated cost of design $42,000.

Final design of the theater w/stage and recreation building is 100 percent complete. Design is by Davis, Foster, Thorpe and Associates at a cost of $5,000 and $4,000 respectively.

Final design of the 2 regimental headquarters building is 100 percent complete. This design is by Monroe, Licht and Higgins, El Paso, Tex. at a cost of $18,000.

Last year the committee directed the Army to reexamine the training load at Fort Sill and Fort Bliss, especially in light of the revised air defense program. What have you done in this respect, General?

General SEEMAN. We have restudied all of the requirements at Fort Bliss and Fort Sill in line with the committee's request. The requirements at Fort Bliss are essentially for the surface-to-air training mission and there has been a review of those requirements.

Certain of the requirements for training of the HAWK, individual and unit, have been reevaluated. The HAWK is absolutely different than the NIKE in that it is a more mobile unit and requires a little bit more space, because the battalions must train that way. The NIKE facilities, due to the reevaluation of the master plan, have been reviewed. There will be a continuing workload for some time and training replacements as far as the NIKE is concerned.

As for Fort Sill, here again it is the advanced individual training and unit training at Fort Sill, in addition to the artillery specialist training. There is a continuing need for unit maintenance training, as well as the continued training of the battery officers and the advanced officers training classes which are conducted there.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are requesting funds for a BOQ. What are you using for existing requirements at this installation?

General SEEMAN. This is Fort Bliss, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

General SEEMAN. At present they are housed in unimproved temporary buildings and for school purposes these are not only inefficient to maintain but they do not provide the facilities for good study habits and good morale of the officers involved. Fourteen of these buildings have been approved for disposal since 1956 because of their age and high cost.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Your justifications show total requirements for BOQ's at approximately 1,200. I note you have 2,461 officers at the present time. This means that over 50 percent are in BOQ's. What is the ratio now of this requirement?

General SEEMAN. This percentage at this school post is rather high, sir. First, there is a higher proportion of younger officers and second there is a higher proportion of those who cannot bring their families with them if they are married so that at a school post like this, you do have a higher requirement for BOQ space.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What will be done with the existing facilities if the new ones are constructed?

General SEEMAN. They are tearing down these old buildings at this point.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What would you say would be a reasonable time element in which they would tear them down after the new ones were made available?

General SEEMAN. In some cases, of course, they are torn down to make way for the new ones.

Normally, this would be done within the first 6 months after they had moved into their new buildings.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that a general pattern of procedure under the regulatory function of the military? In other words, year to year up here we ask you these same questions. Perhaps they are a little boring to you but they are rather interesting to us. We find frequently you say, "All right, if we get the new buildings, these are out." We ask, "Do you have any requirements to keep them, standby, mobilization or otherwise?" You say, "No, we are done with them."

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. What would you consider reasonable time? Once you tell this committee you are done with them, any move that you make from the old to the new, 60 days is plenty of time.

General SEEMAN. Sir, I would not be honest if I did not say that in a school post like this, perhaps where the mobilization load is not going to be a balloon but a continuation and an expansion, and you are trying to work an economical plan, you would most likely tear these down. Where we do have a station that has an additional division to come in on mobilization, and possibly a high priority, such as Fort Lewis, for example, there is no question about it, Mr. Chairman, that those old buildings standing there in their area are an asset.

We have run studies of the cost of considering tentage. Tentage, where you put it up and take it down such as for summer training of Reserve components and for mobilization, is more expensive than these buildings in their present condition. This is not what you would put the Army in for a man's whole career or something like that, or where you are doing training, but as pure shelter, all of the old buildings are not a complete liability.

Mr. JONAS. May I ask a question there?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Surely.

Mr. JONAS. Surely it would not be more expensive if you already have the tentage, which you have, have you not?

General SEEMAN. We have some; yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. You have more than you will ever use as far as you can see in the future, have you not?

General SEEMAN. I am not an expert in the quartermaster tentage. I have understood that the amount of surplus duck is not exactly the same grade and stuff that you would make up into tents.

Mr. JONAS. I meant tents already manufactured and in storage.

General SEEMAN. There is an amount of it.

Mr. JONAS. You used to house armies in them. We do not any more.

General SEEMAN. No, sir. We do not make up the tentage anymore. We had a request in the staff—it is there at the present time—from Fort Hood, where they point out the fact that the cost of replacing tentage that you put up and take down every year is greater than the

cost of constructing simple concrete block latrines and buildings to take care of the summer training at North Fort Hood. On the basis of the facts and the studies of the staff and the cost of tentage and this thing, we have had to say that we cannot go into construction of semipermanent facilities at this time as opposed to the tentage here. There are other cases where for our mobilization requirements we just have not got the kind of resources to go into a large stock of tentage at this time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for instructor space here?

General SEEMAN. At Fort Bliss?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

General SEEMAN. Fort Bliss has a rather new building in the last 5 or 6 years, an academic building. In addition, they have scattered buildings throughout the area for other classes, such as for the weapons classes, motor pools and equipment pools where they conduct their other classes. One of the problems at both Bliss and Sill has been the use of older buildings and temporary buildings which cannot take a floor loading and cannot, or do not, have the overhead space for the new missile-handling equipment. At Fort Sill they have the problem of not having overhead cranes sufficient to lift automotive equipment. This is a problem where they use some of the old gun sheds and some of the old gun stables to the maximum. They are just not adequate.

Mr. SHEPPARD. To what extent is this administration and classroom building related to the NIKE–ZEUS program, if at all?

General SEEMAN. None whatsoever at the present time. The NIKE–ZEUS program is in research and development. It has not been approved for deployment. If it should go into our arsenal, it will be integrated into the space. It will be integrated into the existing space.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I call your attention, gentlemen, to the statement on page 266 of the justification:

> HERCULES training, in conjunction with 13 new guided-missile laboratories, will be about 500 to 600. As HERCULES training phases down, it is planned to use the facility for the ZEUS program. It is anticipated that construction of the facility will provide sufficient classrooms for ZEUS training. The administrative space is required to support instructors and supervisors performing duties in the building and six adjacent guided-missile laboratories.

General SEEMAN. That is correct. If the ZEUS were to be integrated into our laboratories, there would be no requirement for any additional classroom space.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There is obviously nothing in here that would be related to the requirements of the NIKE–ZEUS program as such?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for regimental headquarters space at the present time?

General SEEMAN. They are using diverted barracks space for the present time, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are those barracks in good, bad, or indifferent condition?

General SEEMAN. They are diverted permanent barracks.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions upon the Fort Bliss item?

Mr. JONAS. Yes, sir.

With respect to the assembly and test equipment building for the firing site, page 259, are those sites completed?

General SEEMAN. This is McGregor range, sir, about 20 miles north of Fort Bliss, where they have had these practice firings, but they have had very primitive conditions as far as their equipment, and this is giving them some——

Mr. JONAS. I am simply inquiring whether the sites are ready?

General SEEMAN. Yes.

Mr. JONAS. They are in being?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir?

This range has been laid out with firing sites and their drone targets are handled in that area.

Mr. JONAS. That is all.

FORT SILL, OKLA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall pick up the next item, Fort Sill, Okla.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

FISCAL YEAR: 1961 | DEPARTMENT: ARMY | DATE: 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Fort Sill	Oklahoma	Permanent	Okla-1
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Lawton, 4 miles S.	Comanche	Fourth US Army	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Training		1871	Active

II - MISSION

The mission of Fort Sill is the tactical and technical training of artillery and missile units of the U.S. Army with all its component and supporting units, and the summer training of the National Guard, Reserve Officers Training Corps, and U.S. Army Reserve. Fort Sill administers to the following installations, activities and units: The U.S. Army Artillery and Missile School, the U.S. Army Aviation Unit Training Command, all Continental United States Units at Fort Sill, the Post of Fort Sill which is a Class I installation, and the U.S. Army Artillery Board for logistical support only.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	2604	15,252	2587		20,443
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	3614	15,163	2338		21,115

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	124,858	$ 2,249,417	$ 64,522,121	$ 66,771,538
2. LEASED	1	($ 0)		$ 0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959 (Except Land Rent)				$ 66,771,538
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 14,621,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 4,955,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 142,495,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 228,842,538

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY					PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)				
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30June59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m	
212	148	Two Missile Maintenance Shops & Fac (SP)	272	SF	39,380*	88,200	9,800	19,476	2,600	239	582	582	41
212	151	Field Maintenance Shop, GM (Post Ordnance)	274	SF	0	30,000	0	30,000	815	0	815	815	158
422	153	7 Ammunition Magazines	276	SF	49,542	36,165	0	17,444	900	0	454	454	133
452	149	Hardstand (for 2 Missile Maintenance Shops) (SP)	278	SF	358,596	120,000	0	24,000	1,000	0	204	204	42
724	65	Bachelor Officers Quarters (250 Men)	279	MEN	188	1,245	0	250	11,800	0	2,379	2,379	132
					270								

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 Aug 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

164

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

270

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (Continued)

INSTALLATION NAME: Fort Sill

DATE: 1 Mar 1960

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)				
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m	
811	12	Acquisition of Electrical Facilities	281	DLR	0	LS	0	LS	186	0	186	186	39
812	58	Conversion Overhead Electrical Distribution System to 13.8 KV	283	DLR	0	LS	0	LS	240	0	240	240	40
824	195	Gas Distribution Line	285	LF	415,795	80,000	0	12,100	630	0	95	95	70
711	845.200	350 Family Quarters (Capehart)	286	FAM	4,230	1,022	0	350	—	—	-	-	
										TOTAL	4,955	4,955	

*Includes 9,600 SF permanent.

271

DA FORM 1674e-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

(See notes at top of following page.)

Preliminary design of the two missile maintenance shops and facilities, is 50 percent complete. This design is by the district engineer, Tulsa, Okla.; estimated cost of design is $20,000.

Preliminary design of the field maintenance shop is 20 percent complete. This design is by Costen-Frankfurt-Short, Oklahoma City, Okla.; estimated cost of design is $36,000.

Preliminary design of the seven ammunition magazines is 15 percent complete. This design is by Hudgins, Thompson, Son & Associates; estimated cost of design is $21,000.

Preliminary design of the Hardstand is 50 percent complete. This design is by the district engineer, Tulsa, Okla.; estimated cost of design is $8,000.

Design of the BOQ has not started. Design will be by the district engineer, Tulsa, Okla., at an estimated cost of $90,000.

Preliminary design to convert overhead electric distribution to 13.8 kilovolt-amperes is 55 percent complete. This design is by Benham Engineering Co., Oklahoma City, Okla.: estimated cost of design is $9,000.

Preliminary design of the gas distribution line is 40 percent complete. This design is by Fell & Wheeler, Tulsa, Okla.; estimated cost of design is $7,000.

When do you anticipate that PERSHING units will be activated and stationed at Fort Sill?

General SEEMAN. I do not have the time schedule on the PERSHING. I know it is in the development stage. I do not believe there is at present a firm plan of activation of units.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you going to do with the PERSHING missile problem when it is deployed to the field and used with the troops?

General SEEMAN. The PERSHING will displace some of its antecedent weapons, like REDSTONE, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In your justifications on page 272 you call specific attention to the requirements of these PERSHING units and the construction requested therefor.

You do not use those words, but that is the interpretation. In other words—

This permits the use by existing medium missile units which do not have proper missile maintenance facilities or by any new medium or heavy unit (SERGEANT-PERSHING) to be activated; however, it is contemplated that they will be used by one of several PERSHING units to be activated and stationed at Fort Sill, for which no facilities now exist.

General SEEMAN. That is right. This refers to my statement that Sill is in the process of adjusting to the missile units as opposed to the old tube artillery, and their existing facilities are not adequate in strength, size, or location to take care of the missile mission.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would it not be reasonable to assume that the contemplated construction is somewhat premature?

General SEEMAN. I do not believe, sir, there is quite the variable factors involved in the PERSHING as there is in the ZEUS, for example. The ZEUS in its deployment would be a major adjustment of our existing air defense system, although much improved as a weapon for the missile age.

As far as the field army is concerned, a PERSHING unit would be equipped to move and fight with the Army.

Mr. SHEPPARD. General, I do not question a requirement once it is established that requirements are to be utilized.

At the moment, insofar as the PERSHING is concerned, we do not have the first one off the testing line, do we?

General SEEMAN. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I use the word "testing line" because that is even more leeway than the other.

It would occur to me we are somewhat premature with this particular requirement at the moment. I think we are out in advance of our absoltue requirement here.

General SEEMAN. Perhaps we were a little bit misguided. I think the intent was that we need these facilities now for the existing missile units, such as the LACROSSE, HONEST JOHN, REDSTONE, and the oncoming units, such as the CORPORAL and the SERGEANT. We do not want to build them for a weapon which is on the obsolescent phase. They will be usable, and we will try to make them so that they can be adaptable to the next weapon. They are needed for the present job.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you need something for the missile requirement within the area?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right.

The next question would obviously be, and I think you have stated the answer to a degree, that in the construction that you are requesting presently would be built upon the premise of adaptability to missiles other than PERSHING?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There will be no question about that in coming back a year or 18 months from now and requesting money because of different types of berths you may have to operate off those bases?

General SEEMAN. Unless some of our long-haired men come up with a breakthrough of a different size and character.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The long-haired gentlemen so far have fallen on the seat of their pants in the production of what they anticipated, for which I do not blame them too much because we are in the field of the unknown factor. I want to be as tolerant as we can. Here, when we are shooting for what is practically the unknown factor, it looks to me like you are going into this thing prematurely.

General SEEMAN. If we were justifying this for the purpose of the PERSHING, I would agree, sir; but they are needed for the existing missile units such as the LACROSSE, HONEST JOHN, and CORPORAL missiles, and to the maximum extent they will be adaptable for future use and not require a major rebuilding or major addition at that time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When the record comes down, I wish you would clean that portion of it up and state in here, aside from the condition that we find the PERSHING in, the adaptability to the other missiles that are in operational status to the degree that you are justified in programing construction for them.

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would clear that up, if you will, please.

(The information requested follows:)

This project is an operational requirement needed to provide a heavy missile unit with training and missile handling facilities which permit around-the-clock operations and to meet the current security requirements. The facilities requested are for use of heavy and/or medium missile battalions and their supporting units. The design has been based on a battalion having four firing batteries and an organic direct support detachment but may be used without change by other medium or heavy units. This permits their use by existing medium

missile units which do not have proper missile maintenance facilities and by any new medium or heavy unit to be activated. The existing medium missile maintenance shops cannot be utilized as the floors will not accommodate the heavy equipment, and the building sizes (height, width, and length) are too small for the newer larger equipment.

Additional information is classified and will be provided the committee separately.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What ranges do you have at Fort Sill to fire the LACROSSE, REDSTONE, CORPORAL, SERGEANT, and HONEST JOHN type missiles referred to here?

General SEEMAN. At Fort Sill we have at the present time a total of over 100,000 acres. This has been the site of the Artillery School for years, and just about 3 or 4 years ago there was a major expansion in the area.

The ranges at Fort Sill will be able to accommodate the LACROSSE after development of an inflight safety system scheduled to be operational this year. They cannot accommodate firing of the CORPORAL or SERGEANT and the larger type missiles. For the annual service practice of the larger missile units they must be, or the cadres must be sent to White Sands for firing on the White Sands range, which is a longer range, but all of their instruction, individual and unit instruction, for all surface-to-surface missile systems can be done at Fort Sill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is the Army actually procuring ammunition and missiles on the basis of a 45- to 60-day supply being on hand at Fort Sill? I have reference specifically to the fiscal year 1960 and 1961 Army procurement programs.

We have listened to that in another committee hearing.

General SEEMAN. I do not know what the level of supply at Fort Sill is, but it is not a tactical base: it is a school base so that their annual requirements for training ammunition would be relatively higher than another post which is not putting through so many classes on an assembly-line basis.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The question is on the basis of a 45- to 60-day supply being on hand at Fort Sill.

That is the real meat of the question I have asked. If you do not have the answer, look it up and supply it for the record. Do you have it immediately? If so, all right.

General SEEMAN. I have the justification for the seven ammunition magazines. It is based upon a 45- to 60-day stock level. Experience during the past 3 years shows issues average 1,000 tons per month. The existing facilities consist of semipermanent igloos with a capacity of 200 tons. These are not large enough, nor do they have the facilities to handle the new heavy rockets.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are you buying supplies within the so-called bracket of the 45- and 60-day requirement as of now or contemplated in this year's budget that is under consideration by another committee, if you know?

General SEEMAN. With the newer missiles, the answer is probably we do have current procurement. With regard to the conventional artillery, chances are the ammunition would be shipped from existing stocks at ordnance depots.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think you had better check that for the record through your procurement checkout on that, if you will, please.

(Information requested follows:)

Insofar as conventional ammunition is concerned the answer is "Yes." Not so precise an answer can be given for missiles. Missiles are procured according to the Army materiel control program and then allocated to commands by number of missiles with related materiel. Strictly speaking there is no 45 or 60 day level for missiles. From its class and unit firing schedules the artillery center can then estimate what its requirements will be for a given 45- or 60-day period.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When do you propose to activate the medium or heavy missile unit at this installation which would require these hard stands and missile maintenance shops and why do you select Fort Sill for the location of this unit, if you know?

General SEEMAN. Fort Sill will not be the permanent station for many units. There will be a demonstration type unit of each missile category there for the purposes of training and teaching the officers and men. Actually at the present time there are CORPORAL and HONEST JOHN units in being and LACROSSE units in being.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you have added information in response to the question, will you supply that?

General SEEMAN. We will give you a more complete answer. I am not sure of the schedule on the SERGEANT units.

(Information requested follows:)

These units are activated and trained at Fort Sill, the U.S. Army Artillery and Missile Center, because of its artillery know-how for training and the large investment we already have there. Individuals are trained, the units are activated and trained here, and then deployed to their proper station in the United States or oversea theaters.

Additional information is classified and will be provided the committee separately.

Mr. JONAS. May I follow that one step, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Certainly.

Mr. JONAS. I need a little more information to convince me that it is wise to keep building up facilities at Fort Sill. Everyone concerned admits that the range is not there. Isn't it a mistake, as you look into the future, as we get into these missiles? You say the CORPORAL is in being. It is being phased out. We are not going to be using the CORPORAL.

General SEEMAN. That is true.

Mr. JONAS. It is not sufficient even for the SERGEANT. Your range is not sufficient. Isn't it a mistake to keep pouring millions a year into Fort Sill when its future is uncertain.

General SEEMAN. In the same context of thinking, these new missiles are more expensive.

We are not going to be firing them every hour on the hour. There will be one or two live firings and at the present time the thinking is that for this annual period they will go, for the longer ranges, to either the White Sands range or on the west coast we are thinking of Camp Irwin.

Mr. JONAS. That is a long ways from Sill.

General SEEMAN. The ones from the central part of the country would go to the White Sands range. Because you can train your people on a mockup basis with these new training aids in classrooms, we have a reason for the retention of Sill.

Mr. JONAS. You cannot give them the practical experience, the actual firing. You have to transport them long distances.

General SEEMAN. As far as everything up to the firing, simulating, field maneuvers, going into the field areas, setting up their equipment, and going through all the motions of laying out and sighting on their targets and everything——

Mr. JONAS. You think it is economically sound to split the training into two different geographic areas that way? They have their theoretical training in a classroom in one place and then you transport men to another location for training.

General SEEMAN. This has been the conclusion to date. We could not accommodate either the major or——

Mr. JONAS. What about the future use of Sill?

General SEEMAN. Well, sir, with the big capital investment in the plant there and the number of acres that you would need anywhere, and regardless of whether this is an acre in a desert or an acre in the highest agriculture area, it causes the same amount of personal——

(Additional information is as follows:)

The Army has a very large investment at Fort Sill. We are using this investment to our advantage. Our shorter range missiles and all our "tube" artillery can be fired at Fort Sill. Except for the actual firing, most of the required training in our longer range missiles can be conducted at Fort Sill.

The existing facilities at Fort Sill are being fully utilized. The construction sought by our current budget is to allow for that missile training that can and should be conducted at Fort Sill. These moneys are required if we are to continue to get maximum return on what we now have invested at Fort Sill. Any moneys to support missile firings would be separate from these regardless of where the firings are conducted.

Mr. JONAS. But we are adding to that, $5 million this year, or $4.9 in new facilities at Sill.

General SEEMAN. That is correct, for the new units, but we are not asking for any range.

Mr. JONAS. For training in missiles that you cannot fire there.

General SEEMAN. We cannot fire any of the antiaircraft missiles anywhere except at Fort Bliss, also, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why can't you?

General SEEMAN. Because of the airspace and the danger in the areas. We do have a training area in Alaska where they have a range where they fire them live, but the annual training practice of the missiles is conducted at Fort Bliss. They take the selected cadre, the firing cadre, and they crawl under the tent of the existing overhead in the Fort Bliss area for their messing and supply.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall stand adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 1960.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Last evening we were considering Fort Sill shown on pages 270 and 271 of the justifications. We shall proceed from that point.

What are you using for BOQ spaces at this facility at the present time and what will be done with them if the new quarters are constructed?

General SEEMAN. The bachelor officers at the present time are living in 188 permanent spaces and 1,667 BOQ spaces in converted barracks buildings.

If the present request is approved this will provide an additional increment of permanent construction and the equivalent temporary construction that is vacated will revert to barracks space or will be disposed of, depending upon the mission of the station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would relate the BOQ requirement here to the total present officer strength. The record shows the requirement to be in excess of 50 percent of this strength.

General SEEMAN. The present officer strength as of June 30, 1959, is 2,604. The long-range strength at Fort Sill is 3,614.

Fort Sill is a hard-core field artillery school post, and as such has a relatively higher percentage of younger bachelor officers who come in for the periods of their classes. Some large part of them are on temporary duty.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you feel that the excess of approximately 50 percent of the strength is necessary?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you intend to load the place up to that degree? Are your backlog and workload requirements such that this is required?

General SEEMAN. As we approach the requirement of 1,433 we will take a much harder look at it, of course.

As of the present, where we have an existing inventory of only 188 permanent BOQ spaces, and where we are asking for 250, our present building level for permanent is quite low compared to the requirement as stated, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What authority did the Army have to enter into an agreement with a private utility company to acquire private lines prior to a specific authorization therefor by the Congress?

This question is brought up with reference to the item on page 281 entitled "Acquisition of electrical facilities."

General SEEMAN. The authority for business arrangements of this nature stems from our maintenance responsibility for providing utilities to a station, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would you interpret authority to purchase? There is some difference in the interpretation of the word "provide."

General SEEMAN. The interrelation of the electrical service is very similar, as I understand it, to the provision of telephone service, where regardless of who actually furnishes it, a certain amount of construction on Government land is required by the Government.

Working out the agreements as to the furnishing of the facilities and the rates under which that is paid, where you get bulk rates under different circumstances, is one business arrangement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Take this matter up with the Judge Advocate General's Office and give us his opinion on this.

General SEEMAN. There are two agencies involved. The Public Service Co. of Oklahoma as well as the Southwestern Power Administration, which is an agency of the Federal Government. It requires complicated business negotiation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. By interpretation of the act there might be some line of demarcation between that of the Federal Government's ownership versus that of private ownership. I think it might be well, if you get the opportunity, to place in the record the legal interpretation here to cover this situation.

(The information requested follows:)

JAG STATEMENT

Concerning the request for approval of the acquisition at Fort Sill of electrical facilities consisting of a substation, capacitor station, and two feeder lines, the following additional information is furnished:

Information obtained from the post engineer, Fort Sill, Okla., shows that the Public Service Co. of Oklahoma submitted a written proposal to sell to the U.S. Government the electrical facilities referred to by General Seeman. Subsequently request was made to higher authority by Fort Sill officials for authorization to purchase such facilities with maintenance and operations funds. This request was denied and Fort Sill was instructed to submit a request and justification for authorization of the project under the Military Construction Act. The request and justification submitted resulted in line item No. B 408-12. Subsequent to the receipt of the written proposal, Fort Sill post engineer officials entered into discussions with the Public Service Co. of Oklahoma and indicated that the Government could purchase those electrical facilities, which were on Government-owned land, only if and when authority was obtained under the Military Construction Act. To obtain the necessary utility services in the purchase of electric power, a formal lease agreement was entered into with the Public Service Co. of Oklahoma providing for the lease of the facilities, at a specified amount, for a specified period of time, with an option running to the Government to permit renewal. This lease agreement contained a provision which also permitted the Government to terminate the lease at any time upon its purchase of the electrical facilities. Other provisions called for reductions in the total monthly rental charges "if and when the Government purchased" any of the electrical facilities from the lessor. The term "agreement" in the construction item justification data did not refer to a formal written agreement but merely an understanding between the parties concerning the terms under which the facilities could be acquired by the Government, "if and when" proper authorization was obtained under the Military Construction Act.

The Judge Advocate General has given his opinion that under the foregoing factual situation no legally binding contract was entered into by the Government which obligated the Government to purchase the facilities. He has further indicated that the actions which took place cannot be legally interpreted as constituting a violation of existing statutes which prohibit the purchase of land unless expressly authorized by law.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I also note that the estimated savings of $32,600 will take in excess of 5 years to amortize the purchase.

Are you in agreement with that?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir, on a straight line basis.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on this item?

Mr. LAIRD. No questions.

FIFTH ARMY

Mr. SHEPPARD. Turning now to the 5th Army we shall insert page 289 in the record.

(The page follows:)

[In thousands of dollars]

	Prior authorization	Proposed authorization	Proposed funding
5th Army	873	7,317	8,190
Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind	873	0	873
Fort Leavenworth, Kans	0	1,370	1,370
St. Louis Support Center, Mo	0	2,188	2,188
Fort Leonard Wood, Mo	0	3,759	3,759

FORT BENJAMIN HARRISON, IND.

The first item is Fort Benjamin Harrison.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 60

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Fort Benjamin Harrison	Indiana	Permanent	Ind-1
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Indianapolis, 14 Miles SW	Marion	Fifth U. S. Army	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Training and Administration		1906	Active

II - MISSION

Logistic Support of:
U. S. Army Finance Center, Hq. VI U.S. Army Corps (Reserve), The Adjutant General's School, The Finance School, The Adjutant General's Board, Enlisted Evaluation Center, and Field Division, Office of the Chief of Finance.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	527	1471	4783		6781
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	912	2115	5356		8383

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	2680	$ 271,172	$ 31,773,890	$ 32,045,062
2. LEASED	0	( )		$ 0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF (Except Land Rent)				$ 32,045,062
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 783,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 0
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 27,371,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 60,199,062

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY					PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)				
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30Jun59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30Jun59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m	
		Prior Authorization											
		P.L. 85/685											
722	67	Reconvert Bldgs 114 & 115 to Barracks	291	Men	1680*	-	LS	0	132	132	0	132	277
723	9	Consolidated EM Mess	292	SF	0	23,455	23,455	0	741	741	0	741	278
										TOTAL	0	873	
		*Includes 500 spaces to be reconverted under this item.											
					290								

DD FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

(See notes on following page.)

Final design for item to reconnect buildings 114 and 115 to barracks is 100 percent complete. This design is by Allen & Kelley, Indianapolis, Ind., at a cost of $6,000.

Final design of the consolidated mess is 100 percent complete. This design is by Fleck, Quebe & Reid Associates, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind., at a cost of $37,000.

Last year Congress refused the request for funds for these two facilities. Since that time the strength of the station for enlisted personnel has dropped from 1,951 to 1,471. What else has changed with reference to this requirement since you were last before this committee?

General SEEMAN. This reference is to Fort Benjamin Harrison, sir?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is correct.

General SEEMAN. There has been no major change in mission at this station, which is the Army Finance Center, a Reserve Corps headquarters, the Adjutant General's School, the Finance School, and various ancillary missions.

From time to time there do occur adjustments of the strength of various stations in accordance with the overall strength allocation of the Army.

This particular request, Mr. Chairman, is to reconvert barracks buildings back to their intended purpose which had to be diverted for administrative uses in the years following their construction in 1939.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, instead of utilizing them for the original purpose as barracks, because of the reduction in manpower they were used for an administrative purpose?

General SEEMAN. That is right. Now that we have had approved and constructed a building properly for the Army Finance School and the Adjutant General's School this is being done.

(Discussion held off the record.)

General SEEMAN. This will provide putting some of the personnel living in substandard areas and in frame buildings into these permanent barracks and it will more properly house them.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What will you do with the quarters you are presently vacating if this modification is financed?

General SEEMAN. They will revert to the post and be disposed or used for some lesser living purpose, depending upon the mission of the post.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Supply information for the record in a more specific way.

(The information requested follows:)

At the present time and on an expedient basis, a total of 489 enlisted personnel are occupying the buildings proposed for reconversion. Building 114 presently houses 139 troops and provides space for The Adjutant General Battalion Headquarters. Building 115 houses 350 troops of The Adjutant General School. The previous statement was partly in error inasmuch as it is not intended to move troops presently housed elsewhere into buildings 114 and 115 when reconversion is completed. The buildings will be used to provide adequate barracks for those troops now utilizing the buildings on an expedient basis.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on this item?

Mr. LAIRD. I have no questions.

FORT LEAVENWORTH, KANS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall pick up now Fort Leavenworth, Kans.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Fort Leavenworth	Kansas	Permanent	Kans-1
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Leavenworth	Leavenworth	Fifth US Army	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Command and General Staff College		1827	Active

II - MISSION

Support of Command and General Staff College; U.S. Disciplinary Barracks; Mid-West Relay Center; Kansas City Defense Area NIKE Installations.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	923	1069	1303		3295
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	1742	1170	1322		4234

IV - INVENTORY

	LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	5971	$ 85,010	$ 28,255,941		$ 28,340,951
2. LEASED	0	($)			$ 0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959 (Except Land Rent)					$ 28,340,951
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY					$ 7,034,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST					$ 1,370,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION					$ 17,155,000
7. GRAND TOTAL					$ 53,899,951

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY					PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
131	35	Addn to Communication Center (2nd Incr)	294	SF	21,000	14,000	0	14,000	332	0	332	332
711	36	Replace Electrical Service in 96 Qtrs	296	DLR	0	LS	0	LS	58	0	58	58
724	8	BOQ (Female)	297	MEN	345	370	90	35	3,500	922	329	329
811	37	Expand Electrical Service	299	KVA	7,500	7,500	0	7,500	317	0	317	317
831	12	Sewage Treatment System	300	MGD	0	1.5	0	1.5	334	0	334	334
										TOTAL	1,370	1,370

293

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

(See notes on following page.)

Design for the addition to communications center and the BOQ (female) has not been started. Estimated cost of design is $16,000 and $15,000, respectively.

Preliminary design to replace electrical service in 96 quarters is 100 percent complete. Design is by the district engineer, Kansas City, Mo.; estimates cost of design is $2,000.

Preliminary design for electrical service expansion is 100 percent complete. This design is by Robert R. Boles & Associates; estimated cost of design is $12,000.

Final design for the sewage treatment system is 80 percent complete. This design is by Truman Schley Engineering; estimated cost of design is $16,000.

What is the present status of the equipment for which the addition to the Communications Center Building is required?

Colonel SAMPSON. The equipment has been ordered as programed, to be delivered in approximately 9 months.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where are the BOQ spaces for nurses and WAC officers located and what will be done with these facilities if the new ones are constructed or funded for construction?

General SEEMAN. Ten of the female officers now are occupying temporary nurses quarters and 16 of them are in BOQ's and 9 are in diverted officers family quarters. There are 148 existing semipermanent facilities as shown on the table which cannot be rehabilitated as they do not have adequate space for the kitchen facilities which are provided in the female BOQ's.

In addition they are located a mile from the hospital.

We have no specific statement as to what will be done to the temporary facilities except for those living in the family quarters. They will revert to family quarter purposes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice you have a replacement for electrical facilities.

General SEEMAN. Those are some of the older MCA quarters built many years ago where the electric service is now inadequate to handle the loads presently required.

For example, the existing mains in some of them are rated at 35 amperes and the average family these days, with the appliances and labor-saving devices, require at least 50 amperes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You require heavier cables, then?

General SEEMAN. Yes, that and the fact these are quarters built 26 years ago. There is a certain amount of old age involved in this, too.

Mr. SHEPPARD. On the basis of monetary savings how long will it take to amortize the cost of these new facilities?

General SEEMAN. They estimate a saving of $8,000 to $10,000 a year, which would amortize this improvement in 7 to 8 years.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have all the interested Federal and State agencies made available or requested of the Congress their portion of the sewage treatment system costs?

General SEEMAN. It is my understanding that all of the other cooperating agencies in this project have completely programed their commitment. The last record of a meeting we have here is the one held on June 1959 for developing the pro rata shares of the project.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, insofar as your present knowledge is concerned, whatever their interest may be, this has been presented and take care of. Is that right?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions?

Mr. LAIRD. No questions.

ARMY SUPPORT CENTER, MO.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next is the Army Support Center, at St. Louis.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
U. S. Army Support Center	Missouri	Temporary	Mo-5
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
St. Louis		Fifth US Army	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Class I installation housing various administrative activities and technical laboratories		1941	Active

II - MISSION

To supply logistical supply, maintenance, and service support for such installations and activities in the St. Louis area as provided for in the Fifth US Army Logistical Support Plan. To provide administrative support as directed by Fifth US Army. Perform such other duties and functions as may be assigned by higher Headquarters.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	67	237	371		675
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	40	176	632		848

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	3	$ 309,190	$ 6,791,747	$ 7,100,937
2. LEASED	0	($)		$ 0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959			(Except Land Rent)	$ 7,100,937
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 261,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 2,188,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 0
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 9,549,937

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATIONS OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30June59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
610	4	Addl Conversion - Mart Building	303	SF	963,635	158,220	58,400	99,820	2,449	261	2,188	2,188

302

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Design for the additional conversion—Mart Building has not been started. Design is estimated to cost $110,000.

Last year Congress made funds available for conversion work at this center. How does this relate to the request of last year?

General SEEMAN. It is a continuation of that program, sir, for gradually modifying a building which was originally a warehouse and making it suitable for the administrative support facilities in the St. Louis area.

There has been an expanded mission placed in the St. Louis Support Center over the past year which is the Transportation Corps activities relating to their procurement and supply support of Army aircraft worldwide. The specific term is the "Transportation Materiel Command."

COST TO DATE FOR REHABILITATION

Mr. SHEPPARD. What has been the cost to date for rehabilitation of space, including both military construction, operation and maintenance funds, and GSA funds?

General SEEMAN. I do not have information on the GSA funds, sir. We will have to provide that for the record.

General SEEMAN. The inventory valuation of this support center totals $7 million, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What I wanted was the actual cost to date for the rehabilitation of the space, including both military construction, operation and maintenance funds and GSA funds.

General SEEMAN. We will provide that breakdown for the record, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

Tabulation of funds expended for rehabilitation[1]

Item	Cost	Source of funds
Rehabilitation of portions of the 3d, 5th, 7th, and 8th floors incident to occupancy by the St. Louis Medical Depot and the 5th Army Medical Laboratory (1951).	$382,591	O. & M.
Miscellaneous improvements (1954 and 1955)	345,000	O. & M.
Conversion of 96,000 square feet of warehouse space for Transportation Supply and Maintenance Command (1955).	276,208	O. & M.
Conversion of additional 82,000 square feet of warehouse space for the Transportation Supply and Maintenance Command (1956).	224,781	O. & M.
Conversion for dental laboratory (7th floor) (1956)	85,000	O. & M.
Rehabilitation for Army Reserve Center (1957)	137,076	O. & M.
Conversion on 9th floor for Corps (Reserve) Headquarters (1957)	75,000	MCA.[2]
Conversion of 31,000 square feet of warehouse space (10th floor) for Military Traffic Management Agency (1957).	63,499	O. & M.
Fiscal year 1957 MCA project	3,455,000	MCA.
Improve 2d floor for Main Recruiting Station and Armed Forces Examining Station (financed by GSA) (1959).	263,000	GSA.
Total expenditures	5,307,155	

[1] Above data based on records currently available in the Department of the Army includes costs for modification, conversion, alteration, air conditioning and general improvements in the period 1951 to date. It does not include project for conversion of 61,800 square feet of warehouse space authorized in fiscal year 1960, scheduled to be placed under contract in May 1960.

[2] Minor construction.

DEMOLITION OF BUILDING 40–S

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the Army going to do about the demolition of building 40–S which was funded by Congress in the 1957 military construction program?

General SEEMAN. I will provide that for the record, sir.

Design for the additional conversion—Mart Building has not been started. Design is estimated to cost $110,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The commitment to the Congress at the time the funding took place was that you would demolish the building. It is my understanding now that the funds were used for something else. I would like a thorough explanation of that answer put in the record.

(The information requested follows:)

Building 40–S is a 96,730-square-foot annex to building 40 (the Mart Building). The MCA project for the conversion of warehouse space to office space contained in the fiscal year 1957 MCA Authorization Act included the demolition of building 40–S and the construction of a parking lot in the area now occupied by the building, estimated total cost $40,000. Since the overall cost of constructing the entire fiscal year 1957 project proved higher than had been anticipated at the time the authorization was requested, it was decided to forego the demolition of the building. The Army is currently exploring the possibility of arranging for the demolition of building 40–S as one of the terms under which a parking facility concession would be negotiated with private business.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the status of the plans, when were they consummated, or when were they concluded if they have been?

Mr. NORWOOD. We do not have an architect-engineer engaged as yet on this item, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it contemplated that you will?

Mr. NORWOOD. So far the district office has progressed about 30 percent on the preliminary planning for it.

BASIS FOR ESTIMATE

Mr. SHEPPARD. What was the mathematical basis for your presentation for funds here?

Mr. NORWOOD. This is based on the experience of the Corps of Engineers with conversions in prior years.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I presume it has been pretty closely checked by the Kansas City district engineer?

Mr. NORWOOD. Yes, sir, he is the one who did this preliminary planning.

USE OF SPACE OCCUPIED BY RESERVE FACILITIES

Mr. SHEPPARD. What use is made of approximately 77,000 square feet of space occupied by the Reserve facilities?

General SEEMAN. This is the usual Reserve headquarters, and in addition to a corps headquarters there is a center there for the training of certain Reserve units. They have their usual evening training sessions and the corps headquarters operates as a routine headquarters, administratively coordinating all of the Reserve units in its corps area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would assume this is a constantly used operation?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And the entire 77,000 square feet are being occupied continually?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir. As I understand it, 32,130 square feet are for the corps headquarters. Then the Reserve center for the training of the units requires 60,290 square feet.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is used only at night, is it not, referring to the latter part of this requirement?

General SEEMAN. It depends on the training program of the Reserve unit. Many do have meetings at night but they might schedule them at other periods of the day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would check that out and give us an answer.

(The information requested follows:)

The Army Reserve Training Center in the St. Louis Support Center, is operated both in daytime and nighttime on a partial use basis. Specifically 54,660 square feet of the total area is utilized 19½ hours per week for evening hours training of Reserve units. In addition, the remaining 6,340 square feet of the training center area is used daily on an 8-hour per day basis and doubles in usage on training nights for a total of 19½ hours per week evening training activities.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What consideration have you given to the moving of this facility to some other location and provide for a more efficient use of this space? I refer to the Reserve facilities in this question.

General SEEMAN. The location of the Reserve units is planned by the Assistant Chief of Staff for Reserve Components in the Department of the Army Staff. They are located in and near the centers of population and are a type of unit suited to the people in the area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What consideration during the presentation for budgetary purposes has been given in the review? Do you just take this on the law of averages and make your presentation accordingly?

General SEEMAN. No, sir. The location of the Reserve units is set by one member of the Army Staff, and in consideration of the availability of existing installations and space. The availability of this building in the St. Louis area was one of the considerations.

In addition, the fact that the Army is in certain areas leasing space, leased by the GSA in St. Louis, is considered, so that the maximum efficient utilization of this building is weighed against the acquisition of space elsewhere, either by lease through GSA or by construction.

On the basis of those studies the conclusion was reached that it was most efficient and economically used.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Did you study this out yourselves before you came here?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir, with the Fifth Army as well as with the technical services there who, so far as housekeeping is concerned, live under the cognizance of the Fifth Army at this support center.

NEED FOR OFFICERS CLUB, CAFETERIA, AND RESTAURANT

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why do you need both an officers club and a cafeteria and restaurant in this building?

General SEEMAN. The location of the building is such that in the area there are inadequate commercial restaurants. Second, as you can see there is an officer complement of 67 officers and an enlisted complement of 237. In addition, for the recruiting mission there is quite a sizable number of transients, inductees, and so forth, undergoing physical examination and processing.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the justification for increasing the officers club from 5,250 square feet to 11,254 square feet in this conversion?

General SEEMAN. In an installation of this nature this is an authorized activity.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Even though it is authorized, if the workload is not there how do you justify it? Is this justified because of the number of personnel who will use these facilities?

General SEEMAN. It has been deemed necessary for the personnel as a matter of morale and welfare activities, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How many actual bodies do you have living in this particular area?

General SEEMAN. I understand there are no actual bodies living in this area. This is like a small military post in the St. Louis area, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is more or less indicated in the justifications that the necessity for an officers club for one meal a day is a little overstressed from the requirement point of view.

If you do not concur with that tell me why.

General SEEMAN. I shall have to furnish this information for the record, sir. I do not have in the material before me a full discussion of the officers club, if it is a complete requirement.

(The information is as follows:)

The officers open mess is operated in the St. Louis Support Center as the only officers open mess in the St. Louis metropolitan area. In addition to serving the 67 officers assigned to the St. Louis Support Center it provides open mess facilities for an additional 197 officers stationed in the Mart Building in connection with the other Army and military services activities and 180 other military services officers stationed with various military services activities in the St. Louis metropolitan area. It serves as an essential facility to provide recreation and morale activities for all officers in the metropolitan area of St. Louis.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The justifications also indicate you are increasing the restaurant and cafeteria area from 10,290 square feet to approximately 19,000 square feet. Why do you have this increase?

General SEEMAN. The present cafeteria facilities are adequate to accommodate a building population of approximately 3,000 persons with a staggered lunch period from 11 o'clock to 1:30. After completion of this building, when we will be able to take care of our missions, they expect the population to increase to 6,500. The present restaurant facilities are just inadequate to accommodate these people.

The post exchange facility is solely for the military personnel in the St. Louis area. They estimate there are 2,500 military personnel in the St. Louis area which will make use of this post exchange.

OPERATION OF BUILDING BY GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SHEPPARD. The information the committee has is that this is a general office building of the Federal Government in an urban area where the General Services Administration is presently operating. Why cannot this building be operated by the GSA and the administrative staff presently there for this purpose, headed by a full colonel, be abolished?

General SEEMAN. There is no reason why it could not be operated by the General Services Administration, sir, and it might eventually be so operated.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You say it might be. These things should be definitely determined prior to your coming up here and asking for your funding.

Mr. WESTENBERGER. There was considerable study on this, far more than on most items in the program. There was coordination with

the GSA, and particularly through the DOD levels. It was recognized that the Army had an immediate and urgent requirement here particularly as prompted by the mission of the Transportation Corps. If we wanted modification of this building it was necessary for the Army to seek funds through its own MCA program. If we were to wait for GSA we would have to wait quite a number of years.

This is the understanding we have between Government agencies on this at the present time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why would we have to wait over a long period of time because of another Government agency if the requirement is essential? What creates the time period?

Mr. WESTENBERGER. GSA has limitations on its funding programs as well and they have other requirements which they put above this one as far as they are concerned.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, their budget has been limited to the degree they have no money available so they pass the buck to the Army to justify their own appropriation request; is that right?

General SEEMAN. Invariably, wherever we have worked out a situation where they take over responsibility, it results in the first year or two, until they can catch up, with our having to reimburse them for the rental or the maintenance expenditure.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In this case that is not the procedure to be followed. You will take it out on a direct premise.

General SEEMAN. At the present time the urgency of the requirement for the administrative space for the units stationed there is such we could not afford to wait.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Assuming that is true, the time element is important and you are concerned with it. Still you could assist GSA for a period of 2 years until they got underway.

General SEEMAN. We work out many arrangements such as this.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wonder why that has not been done here? The moment you walk in with a direct appropriation and it becomes your baby from here on out, it will come out of your own budget.

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What you are doing is committing yourself to a continuity of expenditures through the years of this operation rather than walking into a temporary situation and helping GSA for a couple of years. You could eventually eliminate your responsibility and pass it over to the GSA.

General SEEMAN. There is no objection on the Army Staff to transferring the operation of this to the GSA, which is the approved agency in the St. Louis area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do I understand that GSA has flatly refused to follow the same procedure they have followed in other operations of like character?

Mr. WESTENBERGER. No, sir; the position at the moment is that the Army is treating this building almost as a military post.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are still doing that and I accept that statement. I question whether or not that procedure is a good procedure insofar as the Army is concerned.

General SEEMAN. Involved in this, sir, is the fact we have outstanding authorization from last year, which, as I understand it, is not completed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Assuming you have that authorization, that does not justify the necessary expenditure up to the authorization requirements if there is a less expensive procedure that you can follow.

General SEEMAN. That is right, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

POST EXCHANGE

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the justification for a post exchange in this area?

General SEEMAN. The post exchange is to take care of the post exchange requirements for the approximately 2,500 military personnel in the St. Louis area. This is a facility available to military personnel in the various posts, camps, and stations, and it is authorized for this number of people.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the actual distance from this particular area to the shopping centers of St. Louis? What is the actual mileage involved?

General SEEMAN. I do not have the mileage. I understand it is in a locality which does not have small shopkeepers and other facilities of this nature. We can provide that for the record, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

The actual distance from the St. Louis support center to the closest shopping facilities is approximately 10 blocks. The post exchange in the support center is a limited service activity operated on an essential item basis only. It serves a total military population of approximately 2,000 in the St. Louis metropolitan area and is the only post exchange in the city of St. Louis. It is operated as a branch of the Scott Air Force Base Post Exchange, located some 35 miles away.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Who has access to this exchange and what other exchanges exist in the St. Louis area?

General SEEMAN. We have a station at Granite City across the river, some 10 miles up river from St. Louis. There was old Jefferson Barracks. That had been surplused and disposed of.

I am not aware of any other service installation in the area. We have some leased spaces, of courses. GSA has some leased spaces for the district engineer and the ordinance district, and there is an engineer supply control center there, also.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How about Scott Field?

General SEEMAN. That is at Belleville, down the river many miles. Headquarters of MATS are now there.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice that for some reason you do not have a commissary provided in this building.

General SEEMAN. That is right. Commissary facilities are ordinarily in the vicinity of family quarters.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions?

SPACE DEVOTED TO SPECIAL PURPOSES

Mr. LAIRD. I notice that the proposed utilization of the Mart Building after completion of the funding provided in the 1961 bill is as follows: Administrative area 745,000 square feet, special purpose 118,700 square feet, basement warehouse 65,000 square feet, making a total of 928,700 square feet.

That seems to me to be quite a bit of space devoted to special purpose.

Do you have a breakdown of the 118,700 square feet devoted to special purposes?

General SEEMAN. We have not had available the report to which you refer. We will furnish this information for the record, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

The breakout of the special purpose space provided in the St. Louis Support Center is as follows:

	Square feet
Post restaurant	15,980
Post exchange	2,520
Self-service center and clothing sales store	10,920
Mail room and message center	840
Dispensary	16,254
Officers' open mess	11,254
Army Reserve Center No. 3	61,000
Total	118,768

General SEEMAN. As you will recall, this building during the war was a medical depot in the St. Louis area.

As we successively phased down after the war it was discontinued as a medical depot, but meanwhile the Government had this investment in a building. It is a modern frame building, well built, and in making use of the building we have embarked on this course over the years.

Mr. LAIRD. I was interested in this proposal we have before us now which devotes 118,700 square feet to special purposes. I was interested in those special purposes.

We have talked about the officers' club, which has a total of 11,254 square feet. That is in the special purpose area?

General SEEMAN. It could be. That generally applies to our relations with the GSA, where they have the responsibility to provide all general purposes administrative space. But they come back to the other users in the area, whether they are military services or other, to provide for special purpose space.

An example of that might be this dispensary and examining station for the recruiting mission. Certainly the post exchange would be a special purpose area, a snack bar would be, and other cases of that nature.

COORDINATION BETWEEN MILITARY SERVICES AND GSA ON UTILIZATION OF SPACE

Mr. LAIRD. The Navy presently occupies the building in St. Louis, at Sarah Street and Forest Park Boulevard, which contains 240,000 gross square feet of floor space with a usable space of 168,200 square feet. The Navy is vacating this building and has declared it as surplus.

Have you discussed this matter with the General Services Administration?

General SEEMAN. I am not sure whether that was taken into consideration or not. I do not know the relation between General Services Administration leased space which they have in the area as opposed to the accommodations within this Government-owned building was part of the discussion.

If it were a Naval facility the question would come up as to whether it was suitable to split and have a divided operation or whether it was most economical to include it under the same roof.

Mr. LAIRD. As I understand it, this particular building will be taken over by the General Services Administration, and they plan to manage these facilities.

General SEEMAN. If so, then it would be up to them as to which of the agencies with leased space in the area would utilize the Government-owned facilities.

Another example of special purpose space would be space to put automatic data processing machinery.

As you know, they require heavier floor loading and virbation free areas. Under the existing rules that would be considered special purpose space.

Mr. LAIRD. In this particular budget the Air Force has requested in their military construction program an authorization for $3.2 million for an aeronautical charting and information center in St. Louis. This appropriation would be for a new building for the Aeronautical Chart and Information Center on the present site at Second Street and Arsenal Street.

My question is this: Has there been any coordination between the Army and the Air Force so far as their space requirements are concerned in the St. Louis area?

General SEEMAN. I am not aware of that specific request, sir. The only answer I can give is that our program by line item has been thoroughly reviewed by the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget, and that is where the coordination is effected.

As a matter of fact, we get repeated reviews and inquiries as to the utilization of space available from other services.

Mr. LAIRD. I wish you would supply for the record what type of coordination there has been in this area between the Air Force, the Army, and the GSA.

General SEEMAN. And the Navy, too, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. So far as my other question about the Navy is concerned, I have been advised that is being turned over to GSA, so that would cover it.

(The information requested follows:)

With regard to coordination between the military services and GSA on utilization of space, there is an intensive and continuing liaison on these matters both with respect to leased space and planned new construction. More specifically, with reference to the Air Force facility programed in fiscal year 1961, considerable study was made of the possibility not only of accommodating the Air Force activity concerned in the St. Louis Support Center but in other Government-owned space in the St. Louis area. After thorough review of this matter within the Department of Defense and the military departments it was concluded that it was not possible to relocate this activity to the support center without splitting its functional operations and leaving part of the activity at its present location. This would have seriously degraded the efficiency of the activity and produced a corresponding displacement of some activity or activities at the support center for which space would then have had to be provided elsewhere in leased space.

CONVERSION COST OF WAREHOUSE SPACE

Mr. LAIRD. What is the estimated conversion cost of the warehouse space per square foot, including air conditioning and utilities?

General SEEMAN. The estimate for this job is $6.12 a square foot for the conversion of the space, but the air conditioning and the elevator service is in addition to that. Air conditioning is about $2.50 a square foot. Exclusive of air conditioning, it would be $11.42 per square foot for all the conversion and elevators in this request.

Mr. LAIRD. Are these estimates based on the original conversion plans?

General SEEMAN Based upon the experience we have had in this building to date, sir, plus other experience which the district engineer might have had in the area.

Mr. LAIRD. Have these been checked closely by the Kansas City district engineer?

General SEEMAN. He has made the estimates, sir. He is the construction agent for this area.

Mr. LAIRD. You believe, then, that these are firm estimates as to the cost per square foot?

General SEEMAN. Firm estimates. They may have been modified as they are reviewed in the Office of the Chief of Engineers who would bring in his more countrywide experience, particularly in contracts of this nature.

Mr. LAIRD. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

FORT LEONARD WOOD, MO.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we turn to Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

FISCAL YEAR	DEPARTMENT	DATE
1961	ARMY	1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
/Fort Leonard Wood	Missouri	Permanent	Mo-1
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Rolla, 31 miles NE	Pulaski, Phelps and Laclede	Fifth U.S. Army	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Training		1941	Active

II - MISSION

Current mission of Fort Leonard Wood and the USATC Engineer is to: Direct and administer a Replacement Training Center. Receive, process and train personnel in basic training, leadership, Com. & Engr. Spec. Courses, and other training as required by Army Training Programs and Directives. Direct, administer and Train TOE, TD and other type units, detachments or individuals, including the Reception Station. Provide training facilities, logistic support and administrative assistance for all training, including Reserve Components. Plan, prepare and execute such emergency missions as may be assigned by higher authority.

*One-time cost for easement.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	954	18,593	1,502		21,049
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	1,308	29,822	1,502	0	32,362

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	105,974	$ 1,481,694	$ 63,782,846	$ 65,264,540
2. LEASED	30	($ 7,982)		$ 7,982
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF (Except Land Rent)				$ 65,272,522
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 5,256,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 9,087,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 132,117,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 211,732,522

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY					PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)				
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m	
722	46	2 EM Barracks w/o Mess (326-Man)	310	Men	0	11,550	1,630	652	26,000	3,473	1,481	1,481	134
723	48	Battalion Mess Building	312	SF	0	185,920	25,560	13,280	6,000	712	423	423	160
723	49	Battalion Admin & Supply Building	313	SF	0	182,000	26,000	13,000	4,000	478	288	288	108
740	51	Chapel - 600-Seat	314	SF	0	82,779	0	12,900	2,800	0	433	433	236
841	56	Improvements to Water Supply System	315	MGD	4	2	0	2	1,134	0	1,134	1,134	92
										TOTAL	3,759	3,759	

309

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

1808

Preliminary design for the two enlisted men's barracks, battalion mess building, battalion administration and supply building, the chapel, and the improvement to water supply system is 100 percent complete. Design for all items is by Marshall & Braun; estimated design cost is $45,000, $14,000, $9,000, $15,000, and $55,000, respectively.

This is one of the first steps in the modernization of this installation. What assurance can you give the committee that the mission at Fort Leonard Wood will not change and that it will remain a part of the Active Army permanent Military Establishment?

General SEEMAN. The Army reviews its training missions and its stationing plans on a continual basis.

Fort Leonard Wood is one of the hard-core stations. This program of modernization of Leonard Wood is one which now has been in process for about 2 years. We have started on permanent barracks and a rather sizable program of Capehart family housing.

We have no knowledge whatsoever that this will not continue for the indefinite future.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is shown as a permanent operation, so I assume insofar as that declaration is concerned it is an arbitrary concept.

However, you know of nothing, insofar as present policy is concerned, which would disturb that permanency or reduce your requirement?

General SEEMAN. That is correct, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions?

Mr. LAIRD. I have no questions.

SIXTH ARMY

Mr. SHEPPARD. Coming to the 6th Army projects, we shall insert page 318 in the record.

(The page follows:)

[In thousands of dollars]

	Prior authorization	Proposed authorization	Proposed funding
6th Army	3,128	5,722	8,850
Fort Lewis, Wash	1,036	539	1,575
Fort MacArthur, Calif	0	151	151
Fort Ord, Calif	2 92	1,829	3,921
Presidio of Monterey, Calif	0	1,633	1,633
Presidio of San Francisco, Calif	0	202	202
West Coast Relay and Radio Transmitting Station, Davis, Calif	0	1,231	1,231
Yuma Test Station, Ariz	0	137	137

FORT LEWIS, WASH.

The first project is Fort Lewis, Wash.

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 60

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Fort Lewis	Washington	Permanent	Wash-3
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Tacoma, 17 miles NE	Pierce and Thurston	Sixth US Army	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Troop Training		1917	Active

II - MISSION

Training of Infantry Division and related units.

*Includes $3095 one time cost for easement.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	1648	20,318	1,648		23,614
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	2091	28,851	1,783		32,725

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	82,845	$ 854,920	$ 98,417,210	$ 99,272,130
2. LEASED		($ 4,405*)		$ 3,095
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959 (Except Land Rent)				$ 99,275,225
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 4,572,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 539,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 120,247,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 224,633,225

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 30June59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m	
124	275	Aircraft Fuel Storage (EW) Gray Field	320	Gal	0	50,000	0	50,000	48	0	48	48	186
131	99	Community Dial Telephone Exchange	321	SF	0	13,000	0	4,290	440	0	145	145	95
214	163	Hardstand, Tank Motor Park	323	SY	321,000	153,300	0	22,450	1,300	0	186	186	78
812	155	Primary Electrical Distribution System	325	LF	1,480,093	4,250	0	4,250	160	0	160	160	97
711	845.300	500 Family Quarters (Capehart)	327	FAM	4,161	4,032	0	500	—	—	—	—	
										SUB-TOTAL	539	539	
		Prior Authorization P.L. 85/685											
219	144	Post Engineer Maintenance Shops	328	SF	0 319	48,000	48,000	0	1,036	1,036 TOTAL	0 539	1,036 1,575	99

DA FORM 1674-R; 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Preliminary design for the aircraft fuel storage is 75 percent complete, for the community telephone exchange 100 percent complete, for the hardstands 75 percent complete, and for the primary electrical distribution system 75 percent complete. Design for these is by the district engineer, Seattle, Wash.; estimated design cost is $2,000, $8,000, and $7,000, respectively.

Final design for the post engineer maintenance shops is 90 percent complete. This design is by Miller & Ashlon, Seattle, Wash.; estimated cost of design is $45,000.

What will you do with the existing facilities being used for the telephone exchange?

Colonel SAMPSON. The existing facilities are temporary buildings which are to be returned to a mobilization type of structure for whatever use the post might wish to make of them.

The unsatisfactory condition of this mobilization type building for telephone systems is a lack of humidity control, air conditioning, and so forth, essential for such switching equipment, with the result that there is a high degree of maintenance. That is one of the reasons we want to get out of the existing buildings.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The high maintenance cost is prevalent in Fort Lewis and I observed that while I was there. It is not because of diversion of maintenance money from other purposes; is it?

Colonel SAMPSON. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think if you examined the funds allowed for this particular base and other areas, you will find there is a backlog of maintenance which is quite astonishing.

General SEEMAN. This post at Fort Lewis is one of our larger posts and it would be unusual if it did not have a backlog of deferred maintenance.

Of course, the entire backlog of deferred maintenance is not one that we would ever fund at one time. Forty or fifty percent involves needed but not urgent work. Good management calls to hold some backlog in reserve for a rainy day, so to speak.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is an interesting response. A building is a building. The use of the building depends upon its original construction.

The next determination is the length of time you contemplate using the building.

If you are going to use the building for 20 years, as an example, then maintenance is a very essential part of the operation. That 50 percent application of maintenance money does not spell out a good management operation. You think it does and I disagree.

How long are we going to have to use this building? That is the original question.

If you will use it for a short time you can reduce the maintenance proportionately. If it is contemplated to use it for a long period of time the 50 percent application is not valid.

The question is, How much M. & O. money do you have assigned? Then you ask whoever is responsible for the disposition of that fund what percentage actually has been expended in maintenance as against what has been used in the other categories, and you will find you have a condition of diminishing returns.

From what I see out in the field, gentleman, it does not indicate that M. & O. funds should be in the same category. It would be better to have the accounts split and have them stand on their own

DA FORM 1674-R; 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

feet as to requirements. You will find in the building operations you would not have such a heavy backlog and you would not have the extreme percentage of diminishing returns which is presently prevalent throughout the field operations.

General SEEMAN. I appreciate your feeling on that, Mr. Chairman.

As you know, the "Operation and maintenance" fund covers a broad spectrum——

Mr. SHEPPARD. I will change the word "a multitude of sins."

General SEEMAN. It covers training activities, maintenance of equipment, all of the day-to-day operation of the mission.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I refer to the maintenance and mechanical operations. There is not the discrepancy shown there as there is in the buildings.

Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you presently using for post engineer maintenance shops?

General SEEMAN. They are presently using scattered shops in various locations, sir. This request is an endeavor to provide a more contrally located and consolidated facility to meet the requirements of the station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you get your funds for these buildings in order to concentrate your operations what will you do with the buildings which you are vacating?

General SEEMAN. The buildings being vacated will either be torn down or revert to other use by the station for lesser and lower priority missions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Based on the savings in man-hours as set forth in your justifications of $65,000 a year, how long do you think it will take to amortize the cost of these maintenance shops?

General SEEMAN. At that estimated saving the estimated cost of these maintenance shops at something over $1 million will be about 15 years.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on this item?

Mr. LAIRD. No questions.

FORT MAC ARTHUR, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next is "Fort MacArthur, Calif."

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM | FISCAL YEAR 1961 | DEPARTMENT ARMY | DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Fort MacArthur	California	Temporary	Cal-4
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
San Pedro, adjacent	Los Angeles and Orange	Sixth U. S. Army	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Air Defense (including Joint Manual Direction Center)		1872	Active

II - MISSION

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 Jun 59	296	1,501	580		2,377
2. LONG RANGE (Phase D)	179	670	856		1,705

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	613	$ 928,580	$ 11,789,329	$ 12,717,909
2. LEASED	57	($ 10)		$ 0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 Jun 59			(Except Land Rent)	$ 12,717,909
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 151,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 11,087,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 23,955,909

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY					PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
131	32	Telephone Exchange (SP)	331	SF	0	4,619	0	4,619	151	0	151	151
					330							

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Preliminary design for the telephone exchange is 97 percent complete. This design is by the district engineer, Los Angeles, Calif.; estimated cost of design is $8,000.

Is this telephone exchange item justified on the same general premise that you have justified other telephone exchange requirements?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir. Subject to your permission I will ask Colonel Sampson to discuss this along the lines we discussed it yesterday morning, sir.

Colonel SAMPSON. On this question of telephone service at a military installation, we have given a lot of study and thought to the question of whether we should have a single communication facility at a military installation, be it Government-owned or be it leased from a commercial company, or whether we should have a divided system with certain buildings being served by Government-owned or leased facility and certain buildings served by an off-post telephone system.

As a result of our study we have concluded that following established commercial practices there should be only one telephone system in a given community.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You mean military community?

Colonel SAMPSON. In a military community. The same principle is followed in commercial practice.

There is only one commercial telephone company in any given community of the United States.

First, the houses—or quarters—are intermingled with other Government buildings, so if we have a divided responsibility for telephone service we have two cable systems on the post, one serving the so-called Government office buildings, one serving the quarters area.

Furthermore, the post commander is responsible for those quarters just as he is for any other building on the post. The telephone in the quarters is the means for the quarters occupant to get the fire department, police protection, and so forth.

If he has to go through a local commercial telephone system he may or may not get help in time.

Third, if the people living in Government quarters are served by a telephone company off of the post, we find their community-of-interest calls are to other activities on the military installation, so the Government must furnish at its switchboard on the post the equipment and the operators to handle incoming calls from telephone company customers living in, say, Capehart houses, calling their community of interest.

Fourth, we find we run an information service for the telephone company when there is divided responsibility. As an example, an individual is associated with the post at which he is stationed. If one does not know the number of Colonel Jones, for example, at Fort Bragg, N.C., they call Fort Bragg, N.C. information and ask for his telephone number. He may be living in Wherry housing served by the Carolina Telephone & Telegraph Co.

Therefore we have to maintain information service for the telephone company's customers.

In some cases, also, there is a mission responsibility such as at Fort Campbell, Ky., where STRAC units might be, where the commander must get hold of individuals in quarters in accordance with the priorities he established. He may require or may not require them to have telephones.

Adding together all of the factors, none of which in itself is sufficient, but adding all the factors together, we concluded it to be logical and good business to have one telephone system at each installation. There is nothing here that is new to this telephone practices as telephone companies agreed to this principle many years ago. This one system can be Government-owned or leased. That is another factor to be considered, whether it should be owned or leased. On the question of one system that is our philosophy.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then the conclusion as to leasing or outright ownership resolves itself to which of the two is economically proven to be the least costly to the taxpayers.

Colonel SAMPSON. That is, sir, with regard to whether the telephone system should be leased or whether it should be owned.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes. Those are the two prerogatives you have.

Colonel SAMPSON. We feel, sir, in our analysis of it that it is just as economical for the Government to own it as it is for the commercial company. We feel that we can provide telephone service as efficiently and economically as the commercial telephone people do. We follow their same practices. Furthermore, we do not have to declare a profit. We feel that we can provide telephone service as cheap.

That is a factor, also, in determining whether it should be Government-owned or leased, but there are other factors, of course, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Which you have already expressed.

Colonel SAMPSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. You do not have to pay utility taxes, do you?

Colonel SAMPSON. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. During the past 10 years, to your knowledge, how many communications systems have we diverted from military operation to the public utilities in the respective military command bases within the continental United States?

Colonel SAMPSON. Within the past 6 or 7 years, to my knowledge, sir, we have disposed of six or seven or eight telephone systems which were Government owned to the commercial telephone companies.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What prompted the changes in those days, with the philosophy of advantages you have just conveyed to the committee, to go to this policy now? There must have been a change of evaluation during this period of time. If the basic principles and the idiosyncrasies involved apply in one instance, they should apply across the board as far as convenience, cost factor, operations, and so forth.

Colonel SAMPSON. Yes, sir. It has been the policy of the Department of Defense that the Government will not own telephone systems until it is justified by reason of military necessity. This has nothing to do with divided responsibility. Therefore, we made a study of the telephone systems the Government owned, insofar as the Army is concerned, as to those which could be disposed of to local commercial companies. Some of these were disposed of over the years under the so-called Excess Property Act. Last year, as I am sure the chairman knows, this was stopped, I believe by Mr. Brooks, saying that anything which is required immediately after it is sold certainly is not excess. So there were 30 more telephone systems, which the Army could not justify being retained in Government ownership, to be disposed of. These telephone systems have not been disposed of because there is no enabling act by which we can dispose of them.

Whether it is cheaper for them to be retained by the Government was not a factor, sir, in the analysis. The factor was, Should these be Government owned for military necessity? We could not justify the retention of them, and so recommended their disposal but they have not been disposed of as of today.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you have that number of exchanges under your present evaluation premise which you apply as a yardstick, which you could dispose of to private industry, but due to conditions and without authority you cannot do it.

Colonel SAMPSON. That is right, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on this item?

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I did not quite understand the discussion of the colonel as far as costs are concerned. Is this costing that you speak of on a comparable basis?

Colonel SAMPSON. The cost of the Government furnishing telephone service at a given installation is comparable to the cost of the Government's leasing that service from the telephone company, although in many cases it is less for the Government to do it.

Mr. LAIRD. That is because you can provide the service cheaper? Your personnel costs are less?

Colonel SAMPSON. We can provide it at the same cost they can, sir, without paying taxes or profit.

Mr. LAIRD. So the difference is in the profit and the tax.

Colonel SAMPSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. But there is not much difference in personnel costs?

Colonel SAMPSON. No, sir. Also, we use the Bell System practices in providing telephone service within the military, identically the same.

Mr. LAIRD. The difference is made up in utility taxes and in profit to the people who are investing.

Colonel SAMPSON. Yes, sir.

General SEEMAN. We probably actually purchase their type of standard equipment on a competitive basis.

Colonel SAMPSON. That is right. There is nothing military about the equipment we use. We use commercial equipment.

Mr. LAIRD. There is a cost for the Government's doing this in view of the fact that we have to borrow the money. You do not consider any of the costs of money that is invested in this as the cost of your doing business.

Colonel SAMPSON. Not necessarily, sir. There is a return to the Treasury, of course, by each individual. The service is not free. We charge $4 a month. In most cases the cost to the individual for telephone service received from the Government is less than the local community service. In some cases, however, it is higher than the local community charge. All of this money does go back into the Treasury.

As far as installation charges and things of that nature, we charge the same price as the local commercial company.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. LAIRD. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Government does not have access to any particular so-called favorable rating as compared with the adjudicated rating under the public utility acts in the respective States, does it?

Colonel SAMPSON. No, sir, not to my knowledge, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. So whatever is charged by the public utility is adjudicated by the commission or the controlling board, sometimes called a commission and sometimes called something else, which regulates public utility rates within that State?

Colonel SAMPSON. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You get the same rate which is adjudicated if you do business with them on a kilowatt basis?

Colonel SAMPSON. Yes, sir. We have to pay the established tariffs.

If I may add one thing else, sir, as an example of this, in the Wherry housing at Fort Bragg, N.C., the personnel living there, I believe, pay $9.75 a month for their telephone service which they get from the local telephone company. The people at Fort Bragg living across the street pay $4 a month, and the people in Fayetteville itself pay approximately $5.20. So on the surface, it appears that the Wherry people are paying an unreasonable amount. In our opinion, it is unreasonable. Nevertheless, it is paid in accordance with established tariffs, where the telephone company can charge the local telephone rate of $5.20 a month plus the mileage between Fayetteville, N.C., and Fort Bragg, some 11 miles.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where does the pole charge enter into this, because there is a pole charge which is prevalent in every State of the Union that I know anything about, from the public utility's point of view? In other words, if they are asked to serve a community and the number of units to be installed justifies it, there is not a pole charge because that is absorbed within the public utility itself. If there is a lack of an established community hookup requirements, then a pole charge is added. In absorbing this in an operation where you are doing your own business, I presume you are hooked up to the outside line and then you pick up your own poles and establish whatever is necessary for the revision or maintenance or installation of the poles from X delivery point for distribution over the base.

Colonel SAMPSON. Yes, sir; we meet the telephone company at the reservation boundary. In the internal or intrabase area, we provide the distribution.

Mr. LAIRD. I do not understand your statement that you get away from providing information service. I should think you would still have to provide information service if you were running your own exchange.

Colonel SAMPSON. We would have to provide information service if we were running our own exchange, sir, and the Treasury of the United States would be getting $4 per individual. As it is, we are providing information service for the people living in these houses served by the local company, and the Treasury is getting nothing.

Mr. LAIRD. Even though they operate the exchange on a contract basis, they still would come to your information service?

Colonel SAMPSON. If they were operating the telephone system as a unit, sir, for everybody on the installation, we would pay the telephone company a certain number of dollars for that service. That service, however, does not include operators or information service. This the Government must furnish whether the system is leased or Government owned.

If, however, a commercial company were providing a telephone system, leased to the Government, for only a portion of the needs or

say the offices of the post, and the other portion of the post, the quarters, were served by the local telephone company, then we would be paying for the information service not only for the offices that are on the post but also for the quarters being served by the local telephone company. The local company off the post would be getting the revenue, not the Treasury.

Mr. LAIRD. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In your description of the requirement you used the phraseology, "military requirement." For my personal education, I wish you would break that down a little bit in its concept and interpretation. What is the military requirement as you used that terminology? Do you mean because of the type of conversations which may be going over the phone, or do you mean the military requirement because of personnel on board? What do you mean by that statement, please?

Colonel SAMPSON. By military requirement, sir, we mean several things. One, the post commander is responsible for the fire and police protection of the quarters. Therefore, he must have telephones in the quarters area, whether or not somebody else is serving them. This is necessary to carry out his military responsibility. That is one example.

Another example would be on the type of conversation or access to people. If I might go off the record, sir.

(Off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Stepping aside from the military itself as a literal function and going to the occupants of the housing areas, that, to me, is a little bit different service from the military, from my point of view.

Colonel SAMPSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Under that requirement, about the two most vital numbers involved would be that of emergency requirements for hospitalization, doctors, and whatnot, and for fire. Other than that, I do not know of any other emergency category which would actually exist. I am again divorcing the military, the movement of troops, and that nature of thing, and confining my consideration strictly to the housing situation. Is that a reasonable assumption?

Colonel SAMPSON. Yes, sir; the hospital services and the community services have been designed to serve the people on the post.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In going through many of the housing projects after the last session, I found that it is the normal procedure from the public utility's point of view to provide S cards or speed cards, call them whatever you may, where those two numbers are separate and you do not have to go to the book. Why is it the military does not provide those?

Colonel SAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, we are providing them on a limited scale and making provisions to supply them more in various areas. Emergency numbers are also listed prominently in telephone directories. We are using that on a limited scale. It should be noted, however, that telephones in Government quarters serve military purposes as well as nonmilitary.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where I found they were not in evidence, what would be the reason for their not being there if you are doing it?

Colonel SAMPSON. I am afraid I cannot give a very good answer to that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would that not be a command level consideration? In fact, it would be localized to whether or not the command level had exercised that prerogative or whether it had not; would it not?

Colonel SAMPSON. That is what I was about to say, sir. It probably would rest with the signal officer of the local command. That is why I cannot give a very good answer as to why the signal officers of the local commands have not done that. It is permissive. It is in the policy, and they know it. This is decentralized in the communication services.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any further questions?

Mr. LAIRD. No questions.

FORT ORD, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now, we turn to Fort Ord, Calif.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

FISCAL YEAR: 1961 | DEPARTMENT: ARMY | DATE: 1 Mar 60

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Fort Ord	California	Permanent	Cal-6
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Seaside - 4 miles S.	Monterey	Sixth US Army	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Training		1940	Active

II - MISSION

The general mission at Fort Ord is to provide the headquarters for the U.S. Army Training Center Infantry and Fort Ord (an integrated headquarters) which provides for the command, operation, training, administration, service and supply of the Sixth U.S. Army area Food Service School, Common Specialist School, Recreation Center and general reserve units, which will continue to operate at this installation. In addition, the Combat Development Experimentation Center is based at Fort Ord.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	1341	18,330	1,619		21,290
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	1478	18,228	1,466		21,172

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	28,514	$ 857,275	$ 69,908,000	$ 70,775,275
2. LEASED	30	($ 38)		$ 0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959 (Except Land Rent)				$ 70,775,275
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 7,910,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 1,829,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 75,446,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 155,960,275

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY					PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)				
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATIONS OUTSTANDG. 30June59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATIONS OUTSTANDG. 30June59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m	
113	178	Access Apron, Hangar (FM)	335	SY	0	72,845	36,045	18,400	1,000	419	282	282	94
211	180	Hangar with Shops (FM)	336	SF	0	101,380	43,510	35,626	2,400	898	832	832	93
711	845.300	500 Family Quarters (Capehart)	338	FAM	3,954	2,011	500	500	—	—	—	—	
740	11	EM Service Club and Branch Library	340	SF	0	95,400	0	31,000	2,150	0	715	715	29a
										SUB-TOTAL	1,829	1,829	

333

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

192

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE. 333

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (Continued)

INSTALLATION NAME: Fort Ord

DATE: 1 Mar 60

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO.	LINE ITEM NO.	DESCRIPTION	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO.	UNIT OF MEASURE	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30June59	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30June59	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l	m
		Prior Authorization										
		P.L. 85/685										
740	157	Commissary Store	341	SF	0	66,000	38,000	0	1,700	1,200	0	1,200
		P.L. 85/241										
214	140	4 Motor Repair Shops and Facilities	342	SF	38,160	128,240	20,864	0	3,000	502	0	502
214	139	Hardstand, Motor Park	343	SY	112,800	190,358	37,500	0	1,950	390	0	390
										SUB-TOTAL	0	892
										TOTAL	1,829	3,921

334

DA FORM 1674a-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

(See note at top of following page.)

Preliminary design for the access apron and the hangar is 10 percent complete. This design is by Louis Graham & Associates, Berkeley, Calif.; estimated cost of design is $14,000 and $25,000, respectively.

Preliminary design for the enlisted men's service club and library is 100 percent complete. This design is by the district engineer, San Francisco, Calif.; estimated cost of design is $36,000.

Preliminary design for the commissary is 10 percent complete. This design is by Robert Stanton, Carmel, Calif.; estimated cost of design is $60,000.

Final design for the four motor repair shops and the hardstand is 100 percent complete. Design is by Floo, Wilsey & Ham, Millbrake, Calif., at a cost of $26,000 and $16,000, respectively.

What are you using for a commissary now, and what will you do with this structure when and if the new one is built?

General SEEMAN. The existing facility, sir, is a wood frame temporary structure. Storage for their required supplies are located in six buildings scattered and at some distance from the main central commissary, up to a half mile away. So they do get into quite an activity of double-handling and rehandling in this operation. They have a sales volume there of approximately half a million dollars a month. The present frame building is just not adequate for rehabilitation, nor is it adequate from the location standpoint on the master plan.

If the new building is approved, the present building will be reverted to lower priority usage for storage or administration, depending upon the post commander's requirements, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How many hours per day is the present commissary open to families?

General SEEMAN. I do not have that information, sir, but I will provide it for the record.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And the same question for employees' stocking and family shopping.

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir. I would presume it would be roughly a 40-hour-week operation, as most civilian services are today, but we will provide that information for the record.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is the grocery part of the commissary operated on a 40-hour-week basis?

General SEEMAN. I do not know, sir. I would have to find that out. They may have two shifts with staggered hours so they do not have to pay overtime, depending on their requirements.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think you will find you have only one shift here and it is not open the amount of time you have expressed here, but check it out and provide the answer.

General SEEMAN. We shall do that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Also, insert in the record a breakdown of the personnel and their service, either retired or active, using the commissary, to the degree it can be broken down.

Questions on this item?

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the question you asked about the number of hours per day the commissary is open for actual shopping. I hope they give the number of hours that it is open for employees' stocking and family shopping, broken down.

General SEEMAN. We will provide the best information we have, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

(The information requested follows:)

The existing commissary at Fort Ord is presently operated on the following schedule:

Monday: Closed.
Tuesday through Friday: 0930 to 1730 hours.
Saturday: 0800 to 1400 hours.

It is open to the public a total of 38 hours weekly. Employees at the commissary work a standard 40-hour week.

Breakout of personnel using the commissary is as follows:

Field grade	259
Company grade	647
Enlisted men	7,647
Other (includes retired personnel, widows, disabled veterans, and military personnel assigned to other installations but residing at or near Fort Ord)	3,746

PRESIDIO OF MONTEREY, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next, Presidio of Monterey, on page 344.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 May 1960

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Presidio of Monterey	California	Permanent	Calif-7
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Monterey	Monterey	Sixth U.S. Army	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Training		1900	Active

II - MISSION

Operation of the Army Language School, the mission of which is to instruct students in such foreign languages as may be prescribed by Department of the Army.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	291	1311	573		2175
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	436	2077	690		3203

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	402	$ 16,009	$ 4,177,280	$ 4,193,289
2. LEASED	0	($)		$ 0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959			(Except Land Rent)	$ 4,193,289
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 1,633,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 19,618,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 25,444,289

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	SUBJUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
724	10	Student Dormitory (EM)	345	Men	440	766	0	440	2,700	0	1,633	1,633

344

DA FORM 3674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Preliminary design for the student EM dormitory is 100 percent complete. This design is by Robert Stanton, Carmel, Calif.; estimated cost of design is $57,000.

There is only one line item reflected for this item.

What are you using for student dormitories at the present time, and what will be done with these facilities if the new ones are constructed?

General SEEMAN. At the present time, sir, the commandant of this language school is using temporary wooden frame barracks and converted classrooms built in 1903 and in 1942. The provision of this student dormitory will provide facilities more conducive to the study habits and the study requirements of the specialized purpose of this school. If this project is not approved, they will continue to use what they have, the World War II buildings. If the new one is approved, the existing facilities are planned to be demolished, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Am I right in assuming that you canvassed the area to find out whether it is necessary to operate the language school at this installation instead of handling the work through private institutions or other Goverment facilities?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir. This has been gone into quite thoroughly with the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget. We had a specialist in the language program who discussed this with all the people concerned. The school has taught students from all the services.

Mr. SHEPPARD. For the purposes of the record, how will deleting this project directly affect the language proficiency of the graduates?

General SEEMAN. It would probably make them less proficient in that they do not have a low noise level conducive to practicing language and recording. They use a recorder system which they talk into and then play back. As you can see, in wood frame barracks where insulation is very limited and interruption from other noises is frequent, you do not have the same efficiency. Actually, it would be very difficult to place a dollar value on it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I was recently on that project and looked it over. What is the unit cost on this barracks compared to that authorized by law, and what is your authority for exceeding the legal limitation?

General SEEMAN. This student dormitory is more expensive than a normal barracks building, where we have the unit cost limitation in the authorizing act of $1,850 per man. It is considerably less than the unit cost authorization normal for a bachelor building. It is intermediate between those two. This is for approximately 400 men, and estimated for roughly about $3,800 per man.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is definitely indicative of the fact that you are exceeding the legal limitations. By what authority do you do that?

General SEEMAN. This is a special-purpose building. It is not presented, sir, as a barracks building or as a BOQ. It is presented as a special-purpose building, semidormitory and study area. That is the basis on which we presented it, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then there is a line of demarcation under the existing authorization, legally speaking, between a special-purpose building and a barracks building. Is that it?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir. We did not feel justified in presenting this on the basis of a bachelor building because the $8,500 limitation

would be much greater in the first place, and in the second place these students are in there for temporary duty for a short period of time.

Mr. LAIRD. Bachelor officers quarters?

General SEEMAN. A bachelor building; yes, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. This is for enlisted men, as I understand it.

General SEEMAN. This particular dormitory is for enlisted men on TDY status.

Mr. LAIRD. Did you present this justification on the basis of bachelor officers quarters?

General SEEMAN. We are not doing that, as I said.

Mr. WESTENBERGER. The description, sir, is a break between the barracks for enlisted men and the BOQ that you would have for officers, only in that there is a comparison between the comparting of the barracks, making cubicles in them for study purposes. So you would not have a vast, open dormitory space where all the troops are gathered together.

(Off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Boiling it down to a very few words, the presentation is made, apparently from the justifications, on the premise of more efficiency to the student because of the present structural conditions which prevail. All other language set aside, that is literally the fact.

General SEEMAN. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any further questions on this particular item?

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, in this particular dormitory is each person to have his own place?

General SEEMAN. In small groups, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. Three in a room?

General SEEMAN. Small groups. Do we have specific information on the quartering plan there?

Mr. WESTENBERGER. No, sir. It depends upon whether we have NCO's or whether we have enlisted men who are not in the leadership group. We have advanced stages of training there. I have been to this school myself and have attended courses there. This is a case of pairing students off into groups of 2 or 3 for study or as many as a dozen or more for study in a particular language. It also depends on what language requirements you have. If you have one language in which you have only a half dozen students, they may be studying together. There may be another language in which you might have 50 students in that particular language, and they will be in groups of a dozen or so for study. They are living together and speaking the language day and night.

Mr. LAIRD. This will increase the efficiency of these students.

Mr. WESTENBERGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. How much will it be increased?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is a $64 question.

Mr. WESTENBERGER. I can state I also have gone to the language school at Yale, and they use the same system in that university as we do in breaking them off in small groups for efficient training.

Mr. LAIRD. How have you been getting along out there thus far if this is such a problem? Has this school been a failure?

Mr. WESTENBERGER. No, sir. We have had to use the old barracks buildings and put some sort of screening between them, if possible. If not, you have to break the schedule into some very odd hours. I know from conductors of training there, we have teaching sessions with students at late evening hours.

Mr. LAIRD. This has been a pretty efficient school; has it not?

Mr. WESTENBERGER. It has been.

Mr. LAIRD. But you believe the efficiency should be increased.

Mr. WESTENBERGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. It is not keeping up with the standards at Yale? Is that the problem?

Mr. WESTENBERGER. I had better explain it this way: that the universities of the country do not give the training in any appreciable numbers, in the many different languages that we teach in the Army. It becomes very expensive to contract with universities of the country for some of our languages because they do not have a normal requirement which warrants their expenditure for faculties, and so on, to pursue the training in a language where they have only half a dozen students, for example.

Mr. LAIRD. But the program has not been as efficient as you think it should be?

Mr. WESTENBERGER. No, sir. We would consolidate a requirement here which otherwise in the civil economy might be spread over many universities. We have consolidated the Army's requirement in this spot and will be able to train these students in these languages.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This was clearly indicated to me when I was recently out there. Putting a group in the difficult-language category into a reasonable unit has the advantage that they can chatter back and forth to each other, aside from the mechanics of the structure, the versatility of talking with one person versus another, the intonations of dialect, and so forth. In other words, if you try to put in one group the students of French, German, or Czech, for example, you immediately depreciate their ability to absorb because of lack of continuity or interrelations between the two types of languages as compared to where you throw them all together in a unit. So you do impair their efficiency by diversification or mixtures of the languages. The students learn different languages as against those going in one field. I admit you go back, perhaps, for other languages, but when you do you transfer to a comparable group. Is that correct? So that obviously adds to the ability to absorb. It is like learning any language. The more we speak it with people who are speaking the same language, the more rapidly we can become familiar with the language and its different mannerisms of expression.

You have been through this school. Is that a correct interpretation?

Mr. WESTENBERGER. That is correct.

General SEEMAN. I am informed it would be very difficult, in fact, to assemble a faculty of the nature that you have out there, due to the many teachers of unusual languages who could not be assembled in a comparable educational facility elsewhere in the country.

Mr. WESTENBERGER. The homework amounts to 3 hours per day generally. This homework is done far better when they are doing it

within just the group studying that particular language at a particular stage of learning of that language.

Mr. LAIRD. I have no further questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The business manager you have out there is a two-fisted, good administrator. He is watching your expenditures, I think, pretty closely, from the briefings to which I was exposed and from my discussions with him later on. It is a language school, and as far as my exposure to them, which is rather limited, I admit, I think Monterey is doing a good job. In other words, if I were going to send a member of my family to this language school or send him to Yale, I would send him here if I had the option.

(Off the record.)

PRESIDIO OF SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then we have the Presidio of San Francisco, Calif. Calif.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

FISCAL YEAR: 1961 | DEPARTMENT: ARMY | DATE: 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Presidio of San Francisco	California	Permanent	Cal-9
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
San Francisco	San Francisco	Sixth US Army	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Regional administrative and logistical support headquarters		1850	Active

II - MISSION

Provide housing and administrative facilities for operation and support of Hq Sixth US Army, Letterman Army Hospital, Hq XV US Army Corps (Reserve), Hq Sixth Region Army Air Defense Command, and the San Francisco Defense Area.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 Jun 59	892	2112	1923		4927
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	755	2616	2380		5751

IV - INVENTORY

	LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED		1333	$ 98,995	$ 28,476,912	$ 28,575,907
2. LEASED		2	($ 0)		$ 0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959 (Except Land Rent)					$ 28,575,907
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY					$ 218,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST					$ 202,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION					$ 32,168,000
7. GRAND TOTAL					$ 61,163,907

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30Jun59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30Jun59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
871	58	Modification and Addition to Storm Drainage System (Fort Baker)	348	LF	52,300	5,150	0	5,150	202	0	202	202

347

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

198

135

Preliminary design for the modification and addition to storm drainage system is 25 percent complete. This design is by Louis Graham & Associates, Berkeley, Calif.; estimated cost of design is $10,000.

Did you not foresee the drainage problem with this family housing location when you built the units in this place? If you did not foresee it, why did you not?

General SEEMAN. This has been an accumulating problem over the years, sir, as the drainage area upstream or upslope has been gradually improved, as sometimes and frequently happens. The provision of additional streets or additional roofs in areas contiguous cause the runoff to become much faster and produces flood problems which were not foreseen at the time the area was built.

Mr. SHEPPARD. General, your answer is based upon written material there because, very frankly, considering the topography adjacent to the housing project, if you get the normal precipitation in that part of California, to which it is subject, the drainage facilities flow right into your houses, which are sitting on what is called a float concrete base. All in the world you have to do is to come back behind there where the elevation breaks down to the level and throw a drainage ditch around there which could divert 75 percent on one side of the housing project. It would go through its normal sequence down to the mission. The other 25 percent could be diverted the other way to the same advantage. They have not done a thing about it.

General SEEMAN. I understand part of this problem, sir, is the deterioration of the old drain. This is an area of very considerable history where there were woodstave pipes at one time, and they have deteriorated.

Mr. SHEPPARD. No, that was not evident when I was out there recently, because I asked about the susceptibility of the final outlet for the area, and the statement was, "We don't have any problem there." In other words, the major outlet for the area is all right. At least they were not complaining about it at the local level.

General SEEMAN. The collecting drains.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But when you are doing your collection up here, that collection is not being taken care of. They said they did not have the funds to do it. Be that as it may, it is the most simple thing in the world to go back up there and throw a trench where the ground stops instead of letting it flow down as it is now.

General SEEMAN. To provide an interceptor.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes. It is a diversion ditch. That is all in the world it would be.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, this sounds like the Air Force Academy construction.

Mr. SHEPPARD. To a degree, there is some comparability, I will say that much.

General SEEMAN. The Chief of Engineer's representative may have a statement on the design on this.

Mr. NORWOOD. The design is 25 percent complete, with the A. & E. firm of Louis Graham & Associates, of Berkeley, Calif.

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is not a question of the design, my friend. The housing design in its origin was wrong—period. Whoever did the A. & E. on that place and left it was so lousy you ought not to employ him for another job, or if they provided for it, then you people did not do the job constructionwise. It is just one of two things. It has been in evidence ever since that housing project has been there. It is not doing any good. You are disintegrating your properties because they receive that complete rainfall and there is no diversion ditch behind it. That is all it would take. It is not a matter of any masterpiece of engineering or soil overlay in there. At least I would say from the exposed terrain there, the overlay would be at least 6 feet at its high point. So if you could run a drainage ditch 3 feet deep, as far as that is concerned, it would divert the major portion, if not all, of your water. It would be better to run one about 4 feet deep, I admit, but that is a matter for local decision.

That motivates the chairman's expressions, which you undoubtedly take with a question mark every once in a while, about your maintenance money. Here is a direct contribution to the destruction of those buildings by moisture content. There is no question about it. I would hate to live in those houses and hang my clothes up in on of those closets during the winter months and expect them to come out without mold on them, unless I had electric lights burning there to absorb the moisture.

It might be well if you called the attention of the local commander to this aspect and see what he comes back with as far as his maintenance money is concerned.

(Off the record.)

General SEEMAN. There is an element of judgment about what you should do about maintenance. The exigencies of the timing generally determine it, and also the relative availability of resources.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why was this not properly charged to the cost of the Capehart housing project?

General SEEMAN. It would depend upon determination of the cost. The utilities for a Capehart housing project within the Capehart housing law must be directly on site, in the housing area. The cost for the off-site utilities connecting it in with existing power, sewer, and other utilities is paid from MCA funds under our general authorization. It may have been that there were insufficient resources to provide for this added item.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The intense inquiry is due not only to the present condition I refer to, but also the fact that you had a flat spot where the housing could have been set. There is an old parade ground down there. It is level. It would have avoided the terrain situation, the leveling off, ground preparation expense, and so forth, and about 12 to 18 percent of the cost. Why it was not put there remains a question. I asked at the time I was out there, and they said they did not know. It happened under a previous commander and they could not say.

Those are thinks which I think are worth thinking about when we consider Capehart housing. You have your limitation of $16,500, and any time you go to any extraneous matters, obviously you have taken some shingles off the house or have created diversions from the purpose for which the original $16,500 was provided, and that is for housing and nothing else.

General SEEMAN. And also the limitation on the outside utilities of a maximum of $3,000 per unit and an average of $1,000, as I recall.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is correct.

Colonel MCCARTY. $1,500, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You say it does average $1,000?

General SEEMAN. A maximum of $1,500 for any single project, but the average cannot exceed $1,000.

Colonel MCCARTY. That is in the law.

WEST COAST RELAY AND RELAY TRANSMITTING STATION, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now, we shall turn to the West Coast Relay and Radio Transmitting Station, Calif.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
West Coast Relay & Radio Transmitting Station	California	Permanent	Cal-20
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Sacramento	Yolo	Sixth United States Army	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Primary Tape Relay Station (ACAN)		1952	Active

II - MISSION

Operate the Army Command and Administrative Network (ACAN) facilities consisting of Primary Relay Station and AAG Transmitter Station. Serve as net control station for ACAN Network associated tributary stations. Provide for such emergency radio, telegraph, facsimile and teletype service as may be required or directed by the Department of the Army.

*One time cost for easement

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 59	4	75	122		201
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	4	4	118		126

IV - INVENTORY

	LAND	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	648 acres	$ 108,000	$ 1,091,766	$ 1,199,766
2. LEASED	4 acres	($ 400*)		$ 400
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 59 (Except Land Rent)				$ 1,200,166
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 1,231,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 4,370,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 6,801,166

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30June59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30June59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
131	7	Addition to Relay Building 102 w/Incin	351	SF	16,910	17,491	0	17,491	560	0	560	560
811	16	Addition to Power Building 101	352	KVA	950	2,500	0	2,500	671	0	671	671
					350					TOTAL	1,231	1,231

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Preliminary design for the addition to the relay building 102 and to power building 101, is 80 percent complete. Design is by George E. Goodal, Sacramento, Calif.; estimated cost of design is $28,000 and $34,000, respectively.

What is the workload which requires a complete, 100-percent expansion of your space capacity for communications facilities in the relay building?

Colonel SAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, the 100-percent figure is in error, sir. It would read 50 percent. At present there is automatic switching equipment available to terminate 100 lines.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If it is 50 percent, I have no further questions.

Colonel SAMPSON. In our justifications the figure was in error. It should be 50 percent instead of 100 percent.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why cannot the additional power here be supplied by private utilities?

Colonel SAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, we do in all cases use commercial power as the primary source in these communications installations. What is requested here is emergency power when commercial power is out, which happens quite frequently.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you are asking for standby power?

Colonel SAMPSON. Yes, sir, emergency power. When the commercial goes off, the standby power comes in automatically. As an example, sir, about this time last year the station here at Washington operated for 45 straight days on emergency power when there was a failure of commercial power.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When you are on a direct line operation and do not have what I call a backup line operation or a so-called loop operation, then you back up to one thing: What is the ability and standby in the public utilities to take care of their demand? They average out their demand load. In the instance of a military requirement it might be only 10 percent that they would have left, or 20 percent. There would be a percentage there because under State law and commission activities they are supposed always to carry a certain standby for commercial purposes. Their ability to deliver that standby, however, is circumvented by one thing. If it is a one-line operation, they can have all the standby in the world but if that line goes out they are stuck. With the loop, it is another story.

You require a continuity of power, and that is what prompts you to come in and ask for this standby. It that correct?

Colonel SAMPSON. That is correct, sir; and even in the loop, when the power goes off for 30 or 40 minutes it throws off all the synchronous equipment worldwide. It gets us all messed up even when there is a loop.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you figure this will take care of the standby requirements for any emergency power for a period of time and, if so, for what period of time?

Colonel SAMPSON. Indefinitely, sir.

YUMA TEST STATION, ARIZ.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next is the Yuma Test Station in Arizona.

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.
Preliminary design for the addition to the relay building 102 and to power building 101, is 80 percent complete. Design is by George E. Goodal, Sacramento, Calif.; estimated cost of design is $28,000 and $34,000, respectively.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Yuma Test Station	Arizona	Permanent	Ariz-2 & Cal-109
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Yuma, 21 miles SW	Yuma	Sixth U.S. Army	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Research & Development		1943	Active

II - MISSION

The mission of the Yuma Test Station is to support the research and development, engineering, and user-test program of the Department of the Army by providing facilities and support for desert, hot weather, and other research and testing.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	52	386	583		1,021
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	48	486	308		842

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	930,445	$ 0	$ 18,880,121	$ 18,880,121
2. LEASED	2,009	($ 10,251)		$ 0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959 (Except Land Rent)				$ 18,880,121
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				173,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 137,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 31,151,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 50,341,121

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30Jun59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30Jun59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
310	71	QM Test Building	354	SF	0	4,000	0	4,000	49	0	49	49
730	86	Fire & Rescue Station	356	SF	0	3,750	0	3,750	88	0	88	88
										TOTAL	137	137

353

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Preliminary design for the quartermaster test building is 100 percent complete and for the fire and rescue station is 95 percent complete. This design is by the district engineer, Los Angeles, Calif.; estimated cost of design is $3,000 and $5,000, respectively.

Will any portion of the facilities requested here be used for the testing of the Army's aerial delivery equipment?

General SEEMAN. They might be, sir. The primary requirement for the quartermaster test building is to give tests for exposure or storage purposes of quartermaster items. The quartermaster has the responsibility for parachutes and other aerial delivery equipment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Can you find out before you send the record back up here so I can have an answer, yes or no. I do not want a probable answer on this. Either they have it or they do not have it. Can you determine that?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir; we can. We will provide that for the record. As you know, this is a class I station, managed by the Sixth Army, although the Chief of Research and Development at the Army level coordinates all the technical services. There is ordinance testing going on out there. Engineers, quartermaster, and the Continental Army Command have certain test activities which are carried out at this station.

(Information requested follows:)

The facilities requested here are not for the testing of the Army's aerial delivery equipment. Such equipment is tested in another part of the post near the Laguna air strip using other facilities in that area.

The quartermaster test building here requested will be utilized by troops testing items; e.g., dressing, fitting, hooking up thermocouples, briefing and debriefing, recording, etc. Some storage for this type of testing equipment, supplies, and small items being tested, is provided.

(Off the record.)

MILITARY DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

FORT LESLEY J. M'NAIR, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SHEPPARD. Under the Military District of Washington is the Fort McNair project.

Preliminary design for the quartermaster test building is 100 percent complete and for the fire and rescue station is 95 percent complete. This design is by the district engineer, Los Angeles, Calif.; estimated cost of design is $3,000 and $5,000, respectively.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Fort Lesley J. McNair	District of Columbia	Permanent	DC-300
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Washington	District of Columbia	Military District of Washington	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT National War College, Industrial College of the Armed Forces, Company "A", 3rd Infantry Regiment, Hdqtrs Company, U.S. Army, Military District/Washington	**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY** 1790	**10. STATUS** Active	

II - MISSION

Fort Lesley J. McNair is a Class I Installation established under the jurisdiction of the Commanding General, Military District of Washington to provide housing services and other facilities to quarter General and Flag Officers of the Department of Defense; and to provide administrative and/or logistical support, as assigned by the Commanding General of the Military District of Washington, for Co. "A", 1st Battle Group, 3rd Infantry Regiment; National War College; Industrial College of the Armed Forces; 67th Ordnance Detachment (EOD); Hq Co, US Army Military District of Washington (EM); 24th Signal Detachment (Radio-Mobile);and to various satellited units, organizations, and activities.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	121	638	372		1131
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	150	705	391		1246

IV - INVENTORY

	LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED		89	$ 102,716	$ 4,223,733	$ 4,326,449
2. LEASED			( )		$ 0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959 (Except Land Rent)					$ 4,326,449
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY					$ 4,111,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST					$ 263,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION					$ 4,800,000
7. GRAND TOTAL					$ 13,500,449

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY					PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30Jun59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30June59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
812	15	Electrical Distribution System Addn	361	DLR	0	LS	0	LS	263	0	263	263
					360							

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Preliminary design for addition to electrical distribution system is 100 percent complete. This design is by Arcady A. Semenoff, Washington, D.C.; estimated cost of design is $14,000.

206

187

Why cannot this electrical power be provided by the private utility in its present lines?

General SEEMAN. The public utility normally provides the power at and to the customer's switching station. Beyond there it becomes the responsibility of the Government on its own reservation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, under the regulatory requirements this is the procedure, and that is the reason you are making this presentation?

General SEEMAN. That is correct. The present source of power for Fort McNair is from the Potomac Electric Power Co. through the post-owned metering and substation. The post-connected transformer capacity is close to the feeder capacity, and the peak demand now is such that it presents a very marginal operation. The Potomac Electric Power Co. cannot furnish additional load until we provide the capacity in the distributing system.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you are putting in additional transformers here.

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have assumed that responsibility in the past?

General SEEMAN. This is customary on posts, sir; that is correct.

U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY, N.Y.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we shall take up the U.S. Military Academy on page 364.

Preliminary design for addition to electrical distribution system is 100 percent complete. This design is by Arnady A. Semenoff, Washington, D.C.; estimated cost of design is $14,000.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
United States Military Academy	New York	Permanent	NY-1301
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Newburgh, 10 miles N.	Orange	DC/S for Military Operations, D/A	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Instruct and Train Cadets		1778	Active

II - MISSION

To instruct and train the Corps of Cadets so that each cadet shall have the qualities and attributes essential to his progressive and continuing development throughout a lifetime career as an officer in the Regular Army.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	600	1,002	2,088		3,690
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	663	1,406	2,331		4,390

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	14,771	$ 1,858,189	$ 65,327,066	$ 67,185,255
2. LEASED	-	($)		$ 0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959 (Except Land Rent)				$ 67,185,255
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 16,033,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 350,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 50,723,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 134,291,255

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30Jun59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
812	51	Convert Electrical Distribution System	365	DLR	0	LS	0	LS	350	0	350	350

364

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Preliminary design to convert electrical distribution system is 100 percent complete. This design is by St. John, Platt & Carlson, Binghamton, N.Y.; estimated cost of design is $18,000.

208

Here you have a line item, "Convert electrical distribution system." Will any portion of this electrical distribution system conversion affect the Thayer Hotel?

General SEEMAN. No, sir. This, as I understand it, is not in the area where the Thayer Hotel is one of the users. This is a part of the distribution system which has extensive, long loops, and at the low voltage of the old distribution, 2,400, there is an excessive line loss and voltage fluctuation. This is a request to provide for increasing this distribution.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It does not influence the Thayer Hotel?

General SEEMAN. To the best of my knowledge, it does not. We will check it, and if I am wrong we will correct the record.

(The information requested follows:)

The electric conversion project at U.S. Military Academy will result in improving the serious voltage fluctuation which now prevails within the entire post electrical system. When completed it will result in substantial improvement to the entire electric power service for all facilities including the Thayer Hotel.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on this item?

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I think the U.S. Military Academy at West Point was taken care of in such fine style in last year's bill that, even as one member of the Board of Visitors, I cannot see how they can ask for very much this year.

General SEEMAN. Please don't misunderstand me as being argumentative, but General Davidson and the Army Staff would not agree with that, sir. This was all that was presented to the Congress, but they have serious requirements. It is an older station which in many ways is obsolete, particularly in the utilities area.

Mr. LAIRD. I do not think they expected to get as much funded as they did last year.

(Off the record.)

Mr. LAIRD. How are the projects from last year progressing?

General SEEMAN. On the matter of the cadet barracks, you will recall the Congress authorized $4,954,000, and for fiscal year 1960 approved for appropriation $4,225,000. When the bids were taken, 15 bidders responded, and the actual current working estimate for the contract which is in force is for $4,399,000.

Mr. LAIRD. How is the housing progressing?

General SEEMAN. I do not have that specifically.

Mr. NORWOOD. That was awarded in January below the present estimate we presented.

General SEEMAN. As I recall, there was a savings over what was appropriated of $300 or $400 per housing unit, something on that order.

Colonel MCCARTY. We also received 15 bids on the housing job. There was lots of competition.

Mr. LAIRD. This year they scheduled the spring meeting of the Board of Visitors on the same weekend as my district caucus, which made it impossible for me to attend.

General SEEMAN. I am sure the Superintendent will miss your attendance, because he has a very fine program. It is involved with gradual improvement of the master plan and relocation out of the central area of a number of service facilities.

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.
Preliminary design to convert electrical distribution system is 100 percent complete. This design is by St. John, Platt & Carlson, Binghamton, N.Y.; estimated cost of design is $18,000.

Defense Atomic Support Agency

Mr. Sheppard. We shall pick up now the Defense Atomic Support Agency and place page 367 in the record.

(The page follows:)

[In thousands of dollars]

	Prior authorization	Proposed authorization	Proposed funding
Defense Atomic Support Agency	0	2,269	2,269
Clarksville Base, Tenn	0	238	238
National Naval Medical Center, Md	0	1,891	1,891
Sandia Base, N. Mex	0	140	140

CLARKSVILLE BASE, TENN.

The first project is the Clarksville Base, Tenn.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM
FISCAL YEAR 1961
DEPARTMENT ARMY
DATE 1 Mar 1960

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Clarksville Base	Tennessee	Permanent	Tenn-19
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Clarksville, 9.4 miles SE	Montgomery	Defense Atomic Support Agency	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Ordnance Depot.		1948	Active

II - MISSION

Modified

*Included in Fort Campbell.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 Apr 59	71	622	112		805
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	71	579	109		759

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	*	$ *	$ 22,883,688	$ 22,883,688
2. LEASED		($)		$ 0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959			(Except Land Rent)	$ 22,883,688
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 200,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 238,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 0
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 23,321,688

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
824	21	Gas Transmission Line	369	LF	0	33,300	0	33,300	238	0	238	238
					368							

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Preliminary design for the gas transmission line is 11 percent complete. This design is by the district engineer, Nashville, Tenn.; estimated cost of design is $7,000.

You have only one line item here, gas transmission line. I suppose this request is due to obsolescence of your line, or what?

General SEEMAN. No, sir; they are comparing the annual cost of coal and oil. The system at present is a combination of coal and oil. By putting in this gas loop they estimate they can make an annual savings of over $22,000, which would amortize this item of cost in about 10 years.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are they reverting now strictly to gas, or doing it on a proportionate basis?

General SEEMAN. This is a plan to make it entirely gas, with a single loop.

NATIONAL NAVAL MEDICAL CENTER, MD.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next, we shall pick up the National Naval Medical Center.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM
FISCAL YEAR 1961
DEPARTMENT ARMY
DATE 1 MAR 1960

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
National Naval Medical Center	Maryland		
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Bethesda		Defense Atomic Support Agency	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**

II - MISSION

The DASA charter, 1 May 1959, includes among Chief, DASA's responsibilities the following (Section IV, paragraph 5.q.): "As a supplement to full scale testing and in order to assure an integrated effort, coordinate laboratory and theoretical programs for the investigation of the effects of nuclear weapons. . . . Where appropriate, supplement the program to include budgeting as necessary." This project is to be undertaken in execution of this portion of DASA's mission.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT					
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)					

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED		$	$	$
2. LEASED		($)		$
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF (Except Land Rent)				$
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 1,891,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ -
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ -

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY					PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30June59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
310	1	Medical Research Nuclear Reactor Laboratory Facility	372	SF	0	25,748	0	17,405	2,800	0	1891	1891
					371							

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Design of this facility is under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department.

Why did you select this location for the construction of a nuclear reactor facility?

General SEEMAN. This was selected based upon an overall study in the Department of Defense and the Government in relation to the location of medical facilities with the conclusion that the location at Bethesda was the most advantageous.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Was that because of operational requirements alone or exclusively?

General SEEMAN. No, sir. It was because of location and proximity to the Naval Medical Center, the National Institutes of Health, and the research facilities in this area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is to become a component part of the existing buildings, is it not?

General SEEMAN. It is a component part of the existing layout of installations. Whether it is actually attached to a building or not, I do not know.

Mr. SHEPPARD But it is a part of the charting and master plan operations?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I understand they have done a little shifting of the master plan for isolation purposes.

General SEEMAN. That could very well be, sir. The Bureau of Yards and Docks will be the construction agent for this structure.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is your timetable for the procurement and installation of the reactor and how does that relate to the timetable for the construction of the laboratory facility?

General SEEMAN. Because of the rather longer leadtime of the reactor, the Department of Defense Director of Research and Engineering authorized from his emergency fund, initiation of procurement of the reactor prior to the programing of this building structure.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions on this item?

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, has this medical research nuclear reactor laboratory facility been coordinated with the program to construct similar radiological research laboratories which are carried in this budget and in the AEC's budget?

General SEEMAN. The answer is, "Yes, sir;" it has been completely coordinated and approved and supported by the AEC.

Mr. LAIRD. How about the National Institutes of Health?

General SEEMAN. We should go off the record on this.

(Off the record.)

Mr. LAIRD. How does this work in with the program at Fort Knox?

Mr. WESTENBERGER. I may respond to that, sir. Fort Knox has to do with a medical research laboratory involved with battle conditions affecting troops. The facility at Bethesda has to do with something much broader than that, on nuclear effects.

(Off the record.)

SANDIA BASE, N. MEX.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we have the Sandia Base, N. Mex.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM
DATE 1 Mar 1960
DEPARTMENT ARMY
FISCAL YEAR 1961
1- INSTALLATION DATA

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Sandia Base	New Mexico	Permanent	NM-1
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Albuquerque	Bernalillo	Defense Atomic Support Agency	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Logistic Support for Headquarters Field Command		1942	Active

II - MISSION

Training, technical, logistical, and operational support of Defense Atomic Support Agency.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 Apr 1959	723	1877	1370		3970
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	752	2652	1785		5189

IV - INVENTORY

	LAND ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	44,387	$ 725,869	$ 55,584,639	$ 56,310,508
2. LEASED	1	($ 50 *)		$ 50
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959 (Except Land Rent)				$ 56,310,558
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 307,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 140,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 2,822,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 59,579,558

*One time cost for easement.

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)				
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m	
510	70	Modification to Base Hospital	376	BED	0	23	0	23	40	0	40	40	258
722	72	Evaporative Cooling-Barracks	378	DLR	0	LS	0	LS	100	0	100	100	261
										TOTAL	140	140	

375

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Design to modify the base hospital has not been started; estimated cost of design is $2,000.

Preliminary design for evaporative cooling, barracks, is 100 percent complete. This design is by the district engineer, Albuquerque, N. Mex.; estimated cost of design is $5,000.

You have only two line items here involving $140,000. Give me a brief statement of the requirements.

General SEEMAN. The requirement for the Sandia base is modification of the base hospital to provide additional facilities for their pediatrics ward. They have insufficient space now to care adequately for their dependents and infants in relation to their other patients in the area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And your statement on the cooling requirement.

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir. The cooling of the barracks is for an MP barracks which was not provided with that service at the outset.

ALTERNATE JOINT COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall insert the summary page for the Alternate Joint Communication Facility in the record at this point together with a summary statement.

All of the testimony concerning this project at the hearing on March 31, 1960, is classified secret.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 March 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Alternate Joint Communications Center			
5. NEAREST CITY	6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)	7. COMMAND	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS

II - MISSION

See Classified DA Form 1674-A, page 7.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT					
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)					

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED		$	$	$
2. LEASED		($)		$
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF (Except Land Rent)				$
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$
7. GRAND TOTAL				$

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY					PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
		Prior Authorization PL 86/968										
620		Construction of Additional Facilities	382								0	10,354
										TOTAL	0	10,354

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Rear Adm. Frank O'Beirne, Director for Operations, Joint Staff, representing the Joint Chiefs of Staff, appeared before the subcommittee and testified concerning the operational requirements of the project for the Alternate Joint Communications Center (AJCC). Admiral O'Beirne emphasized that the proposed new construction is of utmost military importance to meet changed operational requirements of the Joint Chiefs of Staff resulting from the DOD Reorganization Act of 1958, as well as from a possibility, since the original construction, of a thermonuclear attack against the United States. He also testified that the new work is essential to successful conduct of operations by U.S. and allied armed forces in event of nuclear war. He informed the subcommittee that this construction has been assigned highest Department of Defense priority for funding in fiscal year 1961 and that it has the full support of the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Maj. Gen. L. E. Seeman, Director of Installations, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, Department of the Army, assisted by Mr. H. B. Norwood and Mr. L. A. Westenberger of the Department of the Army Staff, representing the Army as the management service for the AJCC, appeared before the subcommittee and testified concerning the engineering and costing aspects of the project, with particular emphasis on the type of construction to be provided and the degree of protection to be provided against the blast effects of nuclear weapons. With respect to blast, General Seeman assured the subcommittee that the most and advanced engineering knowledge and techniques of design and construction would be used to meet the operational requirements.

(Discussion off the record.)

U.S. Army, Alaska

FORT GREELY, ALASKA

Mr. Sheppard. Let us pick up the next item we have to consider in the bill, having to do with Fort Greely, Alaska.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM
FISCAL YEAR 1961
DEPARTMENT ARMY
DATE 1 Mar 1960

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Fort Greely	Big Delta	Permanent	Ala-7
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Fairbanks, 105 miles NW	Alaska	U.S. Army, Alaska	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Arctic Test Branch/Cold Weather & Mountain School		1942	Active

II - MISSION

The Army Arctic Center which includes:

Arctic Test Branch (Research & Development)
U.S. Cold Weather & Mountain School (Survival, Tactical & Logistical Operations)
Chemical Test Activity

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	95	829	112		1036
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	77	711	110		898

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	608,935	$ 0	$ 33,571,723	$ 33,571,723
2. LEASED	90	( )		$ 0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959 (Except Land Rent)				$ 33,571,723
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 10,015,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 2,649,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 13,418,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 59,653,723

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY					PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)				
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDS. 30 June 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDS. 30 June 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m	
711	61	53 Family Quarters (MCA)	385	FAM	168	243	40	53	7,500	1,811	2,243	2,243	163
730	47	Laundry and Dry Cleaning Plant	386	SF	0	5,184	0	5,184	406	0	406	406	164
										TOTAL	2,649	2,649	

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

(See note at top of following page.)

Preliminary design for the family quarters (MCA) is 20 percent complete. This design is by the district engineer, Alaska; estimated cost of design is $41,000.

Final design for the laundry and drycleaning plant is 98 percent complete. This design is by the district engineer, Alaska; estimated cost of design is $18,000.

What is the basis for your unit cost for family housing in this location?

Mr. NORWOOD. These houses are a continuation of the housing program at Fort Greely where we do have construction experience. They are based on preliminary plans which are 20 percent complete and the district engineer in Alaska is doing the designing.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is your proportionate ground preparation cost factor as compared with other areas, and what are you doing about it?

As I know Alaska, you should find yourselves in a position where your ground preparation requirement is about 18 percent above what we have in the continental United States, comparatively speaking. I may be right or wrong, but tell me.

Mr. NORWOOD. At Fort Greely, we have a relatively good terrain. It is ideal as far as site preparation is concerned.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is your frost penetration there?

Mr. NORWOOD. I do not know that.

General SEEMAN. North of the range in Alaska, it would be many feet. As you know, at some of these places north of the range they have permafrost. Down at Fairbanks it becomes intermittent and there you have it in lenses.

In this particular area, it is fairly good foundation and we do not have any trouble or problem there. It is the distance, away off the railroad on the highway, and the higher cost factor north of the range that is involved. When I left in 1952, it was 2 to 2½ times what it would be comparable to the United States.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What was the frost penetration?

General SEEMAN. Several feet.

Mr. SHEPPARD. About 6 feet, is it not?

General SEEMAN. At least 6 feet during the winter.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Depending on the ground formation, it may be 10 feet?

General SEEMAN. It would depend on the saturation of the soil, also.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Again I go back to this A. & E. question: Has this been analyzed to the degree we are going to have upheaval in the platforms we lay down there, and so forth? You are going to have it?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir. When you get into frost susceptible soils north of the range, the only feasible method of putting your foundation for a family house type is to excavate and place a layer of gravel or free draining material.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Diminish your frost?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir; to get away from the heaving-type material. There are cases where we have isolated radar and other stations in the interior of Alaska where we have had to use pile for foundations—metal tubular piles. We have had to freeze them in there with that type of construction.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that because of the load aboveground operation you have to do that?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir. You have got to prevent the transmission of the heat downward.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In performing these functions, which it is necessary to do in this area, what is the $16,500 limitation going to do to your house?

General SEEMAN. The $16,500 limitation is the Capehart.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There is no limitation here?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir. This is MCA. The cost of building an MCA house there is above what is normally authorized. We must present it as an individual case.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That presents a different requirement.

Colonel MCCARTY. The statutory limit there is $32,000; average cost to the 5-foot line.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How far is Fort Greely from Ladd Air Force Base?

General SEEMAN. Approximately 100 miles. It is almost at the junction of the Richardson and Alcan Highway.

PACIFIC

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall pick up the next item having to do with another subject matter. This has to do with the Pacific complex. We shall insert page 388 in the record.

(The page follows:)

[In thousands of dollars]

	Prior authorization	Proposed authorization	Proposed funding
Pacific area	0	7,838	7,838
Fort Buckner, Okinawa	0	2,946	2,946
Korea	0	4,892	4,892

FORT BUCKNER, OKINAWA

We shall look at the first item, Fort Buckner, Okinawa.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Fort Buckner	Okinawa	Permanent	RYI-4
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
	Ryukyu Islands	U. S. Army, Ryukyu Islands	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Defense, Training, and Logistic Services		1945	Active

II - MISSION

Carries out the responsibilities of the United States in the Ryukyu Islands as directed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and protects the interests of the United States in the Far East.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT					
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	658	7,040	16,517		24,215

IV - INVENTORY

	LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED			$	$	$
2. LEASED		11,298	($1,048,000)	193,013,000	$ 193,013,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 Jun 59				(Except Land Rent)	$ 193,013,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY					$ 6,708,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST					$ 2,946,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION					$ 101,160,000
7. GRAND TOTAL					$ 303,827,000

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
131	508	Operations Bldg, STARCOM, Sukiran	390	SF	0	17,700	0	17,700	606	0	606	606
510	494	Air Condition - Hospital	391	Dlr	0	LS	0	LS	998	0	998	998
422	509	Ammunition Storage Facility	393	Dlr	0	37,800	0	37,800	663	0	663	663
149	510	Ammunition Storage Security & Logistic Facility	394	Dlr	0	LS	0	LS	679	0	679	679
										TOTAL	2,946	2,946

389

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

(See note at top of following page.)

23
141
143
144

2906

Preliminary design for the operations building is 10 percent complete. This design is by the district engineer, Okinawa Engineer District; estimated cost of design is $30,000.

Design for the air conditioning of hospital, ammunition storage facility, and ammunition storage facility and logistical facility has not been started; estimated cost of design is $40,000, $33,000, and $30,000, respectively.

What is the ammunition storage requirement for which you are requesting new buildings here and what type of ammunition is involved?

General SEEMAN. These are ammunition storage requirements in addition to their present stockage.

I must go off the record here for a moment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will any of the facilities in this program require additional land?

General SEEMAN. None of the facilities at this particular place require additional land. There is currently under consideration in connection with some of our surface-to-air missiles the acquisition of a small number of acres.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Insofar as we are concerned at the moment, the answer is "No"?

General SEEMAN. That is correct, although there is in this act at this time in our funding plan a request under a general authorization for $6.5 million in support of a longstanding authorization for the whole land problem in Okinawa.

KOREA

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall go to the next item reflected as being Korea.

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE. (See note at top of following page.)

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 March 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Korea	All Subordinate Command Areas	Temporary	
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Seoul	Republic of Korea	U. S. Army, Pacific	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Tactical and Tactical Support			Active

II - MISSION

To carry out the responsibilities of the United Nations Command, U. S. Forces Korea, and the Eighth U. S. Army in Korea.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT	3,915	41,862	21,561		67,338
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)					

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED		$	$	$
2. LEASED	70,673	($ 0)	$ 89,560,000	$ 89,560,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 59 (Except Land Rent)				$ 89,560,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 20,050,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 4,892,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 139,109,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 253,611,000

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
131	302	ACAN Control Rear (Pusan)	397	SF	0	22,500	0	12,500	430	0	238	238
211	113	2 Maint Hangars (Tongduchon-Ni)	399	SF	0	24,000	0	24,000	260	0	260	260
212	297	2 Missile Maintenance Shops	401	SF	0	33,144	0	33,144	527	0	527	527
214	98	Automotive Maintenance Shop (Seoul)	402	SF	48,500	418,500	40,000	6,200	3,900	300	60	60
411	295	POL Facilities (Ulsan)	404	Dlr	0	LS	0	LS	364	0	364	364
421	296	Rocket Ammunition Storage	406	SF	0	239,201	76,960	47,348	4,785	1,540	788	788
722	74	EM Barracks w/o Mess (Seoul)	407	Men	2,993	13,733	292	364	9,600	205	248	248
					395							

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

220d

211
142
17
19
145
18
148

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (Continued)

					395								

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (Continued)

INSTALLATION NAME: Korea

DATE: 1 March 1960

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	Temporary FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
723	84	Consolidated Mess (Pusan)	408	SF	10,000	13,600	0	6,800	158	0	79	79
841	118	Water Supply & Storage (Pusan)	409	MGD	0	0.58	0	0.58	250	0	250	250
841	186	Water Supply System (1st Cavalry)	410	MGD	0	0.68	0	0.68	376	0	376	376
841	185	Water Supply System (Camp Kaiser)	412	MGD	0	0.9	0	0.9	550	0	550	550
860	298	Railroad Spur (Uijongbu)	414	Mi	0	3	0	3	340	0	340	340
740	299	Education Center (Seoul)	416	SF	10,000	10,000	0	3,500	120	0	40	40
841	62	Water System (Seoul)	417	MGD	0	1.9	0	1.9	772	0	772	772
										TOTAL	4,892	4,892

147 24 21 2022 20 146

221

396

DA FORM 1674a-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

(See note at top of following page.)

Preliminary design for the ACAN control rear, two maintenance hangars, two missile maintenance shops, automotive maintenance shop, POL facilities and the rocket ammunition storage is 10 percent complete. This design is by the Far East district engineer; estimated cost of design is $12,000, $13,000, $26,000, $30,000, $15,000, and $39,000, respectively.

Preliminary design for the EM barracks; consolidated mess; water supply and storage (Pusan); water supply system, 1st Cavalry; water supply system, Camp Kaiser; railroad spur; education center and water system (Seoul) is 40 percent complete. This design is by the Far East district engineer; cost of design is $12,000, $4,000, $13,000, $11,000, $17,000, $17,000, $2,000, and $23,000, respectively.

What is the status of the base rights and the other local agreements necessary for these facilities at the present time?

General SEEMAN. We have full agreement with the Korean Government for the disposition of the U.S. forces in Korea at the present time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is this a continuation of the program started last year in regard to building up livable facilities for our troops in Korea?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir; to get out from the quonset huts and tentage which, as you know, after the Korean incident, comprised a large proportion of the facilities. In addition, they have had to realine their logistical support complex as well as provide for the problem of the deployment of the new-type units. As you can appreciate the surface-to-air and surface-to-surface missile units naturally would not be disposed right where the infantry divisions are. They would have to take their tactical positions and have their ultimate positions in possibly a little different configuration. They are using to a maximum extent the existing facilities, but in some cases we have had to go to new facilities, new locations.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is this construction other than a semipermanent type?

General SEEMAN. Overseas in this area, it is semipermanent.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much space is your ACAN control occupying at the present time and how does this compare with that set forth in this program?

Colonel SAMPSON. The ACAN station is located in a quonset hut. There are 5,000 square feet in quonset huts. They are located, I might add, within the artillery range of any potential line of meeting. The objective here is to move well back toward the Pusan area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where will this new control center be located?

Colonel SAMPSON. In the Pusan area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will these POL facilities be in a hardened state or not?

General SEEMAN. The POL facilities are not being hardened.

Mr. Westenberger has just corrected me.

In the Korean area, our facility is classed as temporary. We do not build semipermanent except for certain signal and security facilities.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Getting back to a reasonable semblance of the questions that we went through on the project we were discussing before this was brought up, I ask you this: You are building storage facilities which will only resist an overpressure of 25 pounds per square inch, why build in that category?

General SEEMAN. These are oversea locations at some distance from the continental United States. It is a question of acceptability of the risk and all of the factors involved in operations in those areas.

To answer it another way, these requirements of our troops at the far perimeters of our national interests, we class as top priority.

Nevertheless, we do not, from an economical and commonsense standpoint, build structures of permanent quality.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you are building them on the 25 pounds per square inch basis and whatever balance is involved, is one of those hazardous writeoffs that has to occur in the military function?

General SEEMAN. We hope that by the disposition of troops and other factors we will still maintain combat capability.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You feel that under the situation of exposure that might be involved here, you are justified in going as far as 25 pounds per square inch as against building other types and letting it go at that? In other words, what degree of pounds per square inch protection for the inhabitants who occupy the building in an ammunition and storage facility is considered best?

General SEEMAN. It is a nominal protection considering the risk in the area. I do not think we would be justified, with all the assumptions that are made, in a question of targets and the possibility of damage by fallout, as well as blast, that we would be justified in going any further.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I quite agree. The question is whether you should go that far or not under the conditions of protection.

Who will control these water-supply systems when they are built?

General SEEMAN. There are several locations. There is one at Pusan and then for the 1st Cavalry Division and for Camp Kaiser. These are essentially under the control and direction of our military forces.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Essentially may mean many things as far as the record is concerned. They are either under the control of the military or not.

Is the answer based upon that premise?

General SEEMAN. All of those except in the Seoul area are 100 percent in the control of the military. At the Seoul area command there has been an interconnection with the Seoul system. It is due to the inadequacies and insufficient capacity of that system that this present request is based upon. That is the one on page 417, sir.

CARIBBEAN

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall pick up the next items having to do with the Caribbean operation. Please insert the summary table in the record at this point.

(The summary follows:)

[Thousands of dollars]

	Prior authorization	Proposed authorization	Proposed funding
Caribbean	0	503	503
Fort Allen, P.R	0	295	295
Fort Buchanan, P.R	0	(1)	(1)
Salinas training area, Puerto Rico	0	208	208

[1] Capehart housing only.

FORT ALLEN, P.R.

We shall take up Fort Allen, P.R. first.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 March 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Fort Allen	Puerto Rico	Permanent	AD-8008
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Ponce, 6 miles W	Puerto Rico	Signal	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Communications		1941	Active

II - MISSION

Operate and maintain a major relay and electronic switching station in the Army world-wide communications system. This station will provide a dependable communications capability between the continental United States and points in Europe, the Middle East and the Pacific Area.

* One cost for easement

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT					
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	39	486	127		652

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	1,029	$ 33,543	$4,253,757	$ 4,587,300
2. LEASED	2	($ 131*)		$ 131
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 Jun 59			(Except Land Rent)	$ 4,587,431
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 295,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ -
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ -

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO.	LINE ITEM NO.	DESCRIPTION	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO.	UNIT OF MEASURE	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l	m
442	247	Post Consolidated Property Supply Warehouse	421	SF	0	8,000	0	8,000	110	0	110	110
610	250	Troop Command Admin Bldg	422	SF	0	4,000	0	4,000	91	0	91	91
872	248	Perimeter Security Fence	423	LF	0	25,000	0	25,000	94	0	94	94
										TOTAL	295	295
					420							

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

(See note at top of following page.)

224

209 208 207

Preliminary design for the post consolidated property supply warehouse is 100 percent complete; for the troop command administration building is 100 percent complete; and for the perimeter security fencing is 50 percent complete. Design is by the district engineer, Jacksonville, Fla.; estimated cost of design is $6,000, $5,000, and $3,000, respectively.

How are you meeting the requirement for a property supply facility at Fort Allen now?

Colonel SAMPSON. This is a new installation and will not be operational until the latter part of this year. The people are now being phased in.

The answer to your question, sir, as to whether we have it is: We are looking toward the problem but we do not have the problem now.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask the same question with reference to the so-called troop command administration space. Is your answer the same?

Colonel SAMPSON. The same answer, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When was this facility started?

Colonel SAMPSON. The operation of the installation will start the latter part of this year. Construction started about a year ago, sir. Construction is now underway.

It may have been funded the year before, but actual construction started about 12 months or more ago.

General SEEMAN. Your committee approved last year a Capehart project at that site. It has been advertised. The bids were too high and——

Mr. SHEPPARD. Rebid?

General SEEMAN. The design is being reviewed with a view to getting it within the necessary authority.

Colonel EVANS. It might have been more familiar to you as Camp Losey. It has been renamed Fort Allen.

FORT BUCHANAN, P.R.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item having to do with Fort Buchanan.

(See note at top of following page.)
DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

FISCAL YEAR	DEPARTMENT	DATE
1961	ARMY	1 March 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Fort Buchanan	San Juan	Permanent	AD-8005
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
San Juan, 3 miles N	Puerto Rico	U. S. Army, Caribbean	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Training Center		1928	Active

II - MISSION

Command Depot, Port Facility, Special Training Center, Personnel Center and Dispensary. Responsible for Repairs and Utilities for 13 U. S. Army Reserve Centers. Houses overflow of Officers and Non-Commissioned Officers from Fort Brooke.

*Includes $6.00 for one-time cost easement.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 Jun 59	68	895	949		1,912
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	168	998	1,395		2,561

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	1,563	$325,719	$15,882,477	$ 16,208,196
2. LEASED		($ 8*)		$ 6
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 Jun 59			(Except Land Rent)	$ 16,208,202
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 0
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 17,127,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 30,335,202

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
711	845.100	100 Family Quarters (Capehart)	425	Fam	415	422	0	100	-	-	-	-
					424							

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Here you have one line item that has to do with 100 family quarters, Capehart. You have had the same experience here you had at Fort Allen?

General SEEMAN. No, sir; we will try to learn by that experience and make use of the knowledge we have gained there.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is your design completed here?

General SEEMAN. The design probably has not been started on. Normally, we do not go into advanced design on the Capehart units until we have the approval of all concerned.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You may have the same experience here that you had at Fort Allen and, so far as you know, that could happen?

General SEEMAN. As far as the structures are concerned, they would be duplicate designs. The design would be adapted to the ground and the necessary utilities.

SALINAS TRAINING AREA, P.R.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall pick up the next item having to do with Salinas.

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 March 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Salinas Training Area	Salinas	Temporary	AD-8008-1
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Salinas, 1 Mile	Puerto Rico	U. S. Army, Caribbean	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
		1942	Inactive

II - MISSION

Training camp utilized by personnel of Forts Buchanan, Brooke, and Allen

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH NA

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT					
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)					

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	12,739	$ 560,128	$ 771,943	$ 1,332,071
2. LEASED	0	( )		$ 0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF			(Except Land Rent)	$ 1,332,071
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 208,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 0
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 1,540,071

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
179	52	Trainfire I Range	427	DLR	0	LS	0	LS	208	0	208	208
					426							

DA FORM 1674 R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Final design for the Trainfire I range is 90 percent complete. This design is by the district engineer, Jacksonville, Fla.; estimated cost of design is $8,000.

There is only one item here having to do with the trainfire range. Your subject matter here having to do with this is premised upon the same requirements heretofore discussed having to do with trainfire range projects?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir. The understanding here is that this will accommodate all of the Army personnel assigned in Puerto Rico and provide for certain training of Reserve components there.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions upon this item?

Mr. LAIRD. No.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right.

The committee will stand adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

FRIDAY, APRIL 1, 1960.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The committee will come to order and we shall continue our hearings where we discontinued last evening.

EUROPEAN

First, we shall consider the European area and insert page 428 in the record at this point.

(The page follows:)

[In thousands]

	Prior authorization	Proposed authorization	Proposed funding
European Command Army	$8,637	$221	$10,896
Germany: Pirmasens	8,637	0	8,637
Italy: U.S. Army Logistical Command (Camp Darby)	0	221	221
Forward depot	2,038	0	2,038

Final design for the Trainfire Range is to proceed [illegible] estimated cost of design is $8,000.

PIRMASENS, GERMANY

The first project is Pirmasens, Germany.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 March 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO
Pirmasens Post	Rhineland-Palatinate	Temporary	
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTRIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Pirmasens	Germany	U. S. Army, Europe - Northern Area Command	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Troop and Logistics Support		1951	Active

II - MISSION

To provide logistical support for lodger US Army units in the Pirmasens area.

*Includes $71,271,694 of leased facilities and/or facilities furnished by foreign governments.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 Jan 1959	442	6782	51		7285
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	448	6834	46		7328

IV - INVENTORY

	LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED			$	$	$
2. LEASED		22,791	$ 18,331	791,838	$ 72,081,863 *
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF				(Except Land Rent)	$ 72,081,863
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY					$ 5,979,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST					$ 0
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION					$ -
7. GRAND TOTAL					$ -

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)				
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m	
		Prior Authorization PL 86/149											
411	6	POL Tank Storage, Huttenheim	430	Bbl	0	60,000	60,000	0	2,000	2,000	0	2,000	/1
		PL 85/685											
441	10	Warehouses and Igloos	431	SF	0	354,000	354,000	0	7,882	7,882	0	6,637	/2
										TOTAL	0	8,637	
					429								

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Final design for the POL tank storage is 100 percent complete and for the warehouses and igloos is 90 percent complete; estimated cost of design is $100,000 and $170,000, respectively.

How does this request for POL tank storage compare with that presented to the Congress last year?

General SEEMAN. This is the same item essentially as presented last year, Mr. Chairman. The Army is requesting it again. It is a critical item of the POL support of the 7th Army.

If I might discuss it a little more in detail off the record.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right; off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. What degree of protection will you give this POL storage, if any?

Mr. WESTENBERGER. On the proposed 30,000-barrel storage tanks, ——— p.s.i. from megaton weapons. If the size of the columns is increased the level of protection will be ——— p.s.i., but under their cost factor it is ——— p.s.i. This is blast overpressure.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Tell us why you find it necessary to locate this distribution center in this particular area which requires such extensive railroad construction.

General SEEMAN. This has been studied. We have had the additional year to study this thing, and that is the latest up-to-date estimate as far as the method of distribution and handling is concerned. An integrated tank system has both the capacity of supplying rail cars and tank trucks. That is the concept of this subarea.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How does the Air Force handle its distribution of POL products in this area? Do they use the 5-gallon cans or not?

General SEEMAN. I am not aware of that, but they have storage on the base and tankage to the aircraft or direct refueling stations.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will get more clarification of that from the Air Force.

What degree of hardening will attain for these warehouses and igloos?

You may give the answer off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you doing for this storage at the present time?

General SEEMAN. At the present time the stores are in one area, some in the open and some under cover and in a highly congested location. The present location is the result of the major redistribution of the line of communication which occurred at the time of the Korean war and at the time the decision was made to look for a line of communication from another direction.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What land acquisition is required for this and what is the status of the acquisition of this land at the present time?

General SEEMAN. The land acquisition in Germany is provided by the German Government. As you know, the entire construction is done through German construction agencies. This has been under planning for some time and we are told that the land is available and they are ready to go.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is noted that you locate the petroleum east of the Rhine River and the warehouses west of the Rhine River. What is the reason for that separation?

General SEEMAN. We are really talking about an area in which the present depot is in the Kaiserslautern area. The new location is in the Pirmasens area. It is considerably dispersed. The actual POL

Final design for the POL tank storage is 100 percent complete and for the warehouses and igloos is 90 percent complete; estimated cost of design is $100,000 and $170,000, respectively.

operation which we have spoken of as the Huttenheim area will be operated under the general supervision of the depot commander in the Pirmasens area. So it is really all one centralized area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I can understand that, but here we find a line of demarcation, which is the Rhine River, and you have the petroleum located east of the Rhine River and the warehouses west of the Rhine River. There must be some reason for that separation. What is the reason? That is what I am trying to establish.

General SEEMAN. According to our information, sir, the POL, by virtue of its large volume, as the general who commanded the line of communication pointed out that during the last war 50 percent of our tonnage was POL, and during the Korean war 60 percent of the tonnage was POL. That is the first consideration.

Thet next consideration was to have a dispensing point east of the Rhine with the pipeline underground and the dispersement of the dry storage areas west of the Rhine.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You do not know of any specific reason why both cannot be east of the Rhine?

General SEEMAN. Except for the tactical plans of the Army and how they propose to handle the situation if it became critical. They also have chosen rather hilly country for the location of the dispersed igloos and storage areas.

U.S. ARMY LOGISTICAL COMMAND, ITALY

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall pick up now the U.S. Army Logistical Support Command, Italy.

DATE 1 March 1960
DEPARTMENT ARMY
FISCAL YEAR 1961

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

FISCAL YEAR: 1961 | DEPARTMENT: ARMY | DATE: 1 March 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
U. S. Army Logistical Command	Pisa	Temporary	
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental). COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Pisa, 10 Miles S	Italy	USASETAF	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Port, Supply & Maintenance Area		1951	Active

II - MISSION

Port handling, supply and depot maintenance for Southern European Task Force; Commander-in-Chief, Europe; and other North Atlantic Treaty Organization forces in the Mediterranean Area.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 28 Feb 59	266	1,046	98		1,410
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)		CLASSIFIED			

IV - INVENTORY

	LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED			$	$	$
2. LEASED		2,773	($ 117,471)	8,456,000	$ 8,573,471
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF				(Except Land Rent)	$ 8,573,471
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY					$ 920,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST					$ 221,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION					$ -
7. GRAND TOTAL					$ -

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDS. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDS. 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
843	103	Automatic Sprinkler System (Camp Darby)	433	LF	0	65,000	0	65,000	221	0	221	221

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

432

Preliminary design for automatic sprinkler system is 10 percent complete. This design is by Lublin & McGaughy, Livorno, Italy; estimated cost of design is $9,000.

General SEEMAN. This is to put a sprinkler system in an existing area of warehouses, 12 warehouses, to be specific, to provide additional protection in this post and warehouse compound.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, a sprinkler system is going in the warehouses for fire protection purposes?

General SEEMAN. Yes.

FORWARD DEPOT

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next, we have Forward Depot.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

FISCAL YEAR	DEPARTMENT	DATE
1961	ARMY	1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Forward Depot	Europe	Temporary	
5. NEAREST CITY	6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)	7. COMMAND	
		U. S. Army, Europe	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
Depot Storage			

II - MISSION

Facilities for storage of selective list of equipment and supplies. Reference: Department of the Army letter, AGAO-CC 400 (28 Mar 58) DCSLOG, 1 April 1958, subject: "Implementation of Prestocked Forward Depot (U)"

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT					
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)					

IV - INVENTORY

	LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED			$	$	$
2. LEASED			($)		$
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 Jun 59 (Except Land Rent)					$ 0
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY					$ 3,000,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST					$ 0
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION					$ 2,000,000
7. GRAND TOTAL					$ 5,000,000

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY					PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column g)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30 Jun59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
		Prior Authorization PL 149/86										
411	1	POL Storage Facilities	433b	Bbl	0	20,000	20,000	0	235	235	0	235
441	3	Covered Storage Facilities	433c	SF	0	164,202	164,202	0	1,264	1,264	0	1,264
890	5	Site Preparation, Roads & Utilities	433d	Dlr	0	LS	LS	0	539	539	0	539
										TOTAL	0	2,038

283
284
285

433a (21 Mar 60)

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Why was this Forward Depot not built in 1960 when it was funded by the Congress?

General SEEMAN. The need for the Forward Depot is as serious today as it was then. There has been some restudy as to the phasing, the location of this. The particular geographic area was restudied. It had to be reviewed in connection with locations in which an Air Force operation might occur, as to whether or not there was the necessary ground area. The design here has not been started.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Normally it would be the conclusion of the committee that once this had cleared all the so-called mentalities before it reaches this committee, including the Bureau of the Budget and everybody else, and once you get the money to build it, you would go ahead. Now, somebody changes his mind and makes a review and a rereview. Was the review made in the first instance on the same basis as in the second instance or was there a difference?

General SEEMAN. First we had this new procedure, a matter of overprograming, to accommodate ourselves to.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Was the problem here of a budgetary character?

General SEEMAN. No, sir. If I may go off the record.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. How firm is this proposed location as far as you know?

General SEEMAN. The proposed location is firm.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Not only insofar as the location but the funds requested. Will you come back here a year hence and go through the same ceremony again?

General SEEMAN. It is firm at the present time, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have you surveyed other locations to make abundantly sure you have none available other than that which you are requesting?

General SEEMAN. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I want the record to show that this committee is becoming rather impatient with the repetition of requests, gentlemen.

Any questions on this?

Mr. SIKES. No questions.

ARMY SECURITY AGENCY O/S

Mr. SHEPPARD. Turning now to the Army Security Agency O/S, we shall insert page 434 in the record.

(The page follows:)

[In thousands]

	Prior authorization	Proposed authorization	Proposed funding
Army Security Agency O/S	$2,240	$2,964	$5,204
Location 03, Okinawa	2,076	0	2,076
Location 12, Japan	0	517	517
Location 13, England	0	327	327
Location 23, classified	164	561	725
Location 90, Japan	0	84	84
Location 177, Korea	0	1,264	1,264
Location 321, Korea	0	31	31
Location 321-A, Korea	0	100	100
Location 321-B, Korea	0	80	80

LOCATION 03, OKINAWA

Mr. SHEPPARD. First, we have location 03, Okinawa.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 March 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Location 03 (ASA)	Sobe, Okinawa	Permanent	
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Kadena Air Force Base (2.7 air mi SE)	Okinawa (Ryukyu Islands)	US Army Security Agency	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Classified		1952	Active

II - MISSION

Classified

* Includes: Field Station - 481.75
Yontan Site - 18.03
Bolo Site - 5.78
505.56 Ac

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT					
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)					

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED		$ Annual Rent	$	$
2. LEASED	505.56	($ 50,188)	3,840,560	$ 3,840,560
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 Jun 1959			(Except Land Rent)	$ 3,840,560
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 531,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 0
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 964,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 8,335,560

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY					PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 1959 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDS. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDS. 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
		Prior Authorization PL 86/149										
722	613	EM Barracks w/o Mess	437	Men	548	501	330	0	1,029		0	808
722	616	Conversion of Mess Halls to Barracks	438	Men			112	0			0	100
723	608	Consolidated Mess	439	SF	0	14,600	14,600	0	337	337	0	337
610	615	Headquarters Building	440	SF	0	10,000	10,000	0	205	205	0	205
442	606	General Purpose Warehouse	441	SF	0	6,000	6,000	0	42	42	0	42
					435							

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (Continued)

INSTALLATION NAME: Location 03 (ASA)

DATE: 1 March 1960

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
740	609	Chapel - 150 seat	442	SF	0	5,800	5,800	0	145	145	0	145
740	607	Post Exchange	443	SF	0	4,000	4,000	0	84	84	0	84
219	612	Post Engineer Shops and Office	444	SF	0	1,200	1,200	0	21	21	0	21
550	614	Dispensary	445	SF	0	150	150	0	4	4	0	4
214	611	Motor Pool Shop & Park Addition	446	SF	1,176	1,000	1,000	0	24	24	0	24
740	603	Service Club and Auditorium	447	SF	0	12,240	12,240	0	306	306	0	306
										TOTAL	0	2,076

436

DA FORM 1674a-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Final design

	Percent complete	Estimated design cost
Enlisted men's barracks	85	$32,000
Conversion mess hall	90	5,000
Consolidated mess	90	14,000
Headquarters building	85	8,000
General purpose warehouse	85	2,000
Post exchange	85	4,000
Post engineer shops	90	1,000
Dispensary	85	0
Motor pool shop	85	1,000
Service club and auditorium	90	15,000
Chapel	85	7,000

NOTE.—Design is by the district engineer, Okinawa, for all items except the post exchange and service club. These are by Pacific A. & E. Inc., APO 331, San Francisco, Calif. Estimated design cost is as shown above.

For this location Congress approved most, if not all, of these items last year for funding. I repeat the question I asked on the previous item: Why were they not constructed?

Mr. WESTENBERGER. We had a relocation involved on this one. This site has now been definitely established. The relocation had to do first with a different area and then with land problems in Okinawa. We are using only the land we had acquired by lease from the Ryukyuans in the past. We are able to put the entire facility on that site now and proceed with it. Is that correct, Colonel Epperson?

Colonel EPPERSON. Yes, we can proceed on it now. The design is well along. In fact, it is almost complete on every item. In fact, part of the program of last year, the operational facilities in connection with this overall program, is able to go ahead and is going ahead this fiscal year. Those are the items which, of course, are critical. They are the key to the whole operation. They are more complicated structures and as such require longer leadtime for construction. Accordingly, they are going under construction now.

These items in the program now are in support of those others, and we hope they will be able to be completed together to allow commencing of an effective operation when they are all completed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is any new land required for this construction?

General SEEMAN. Not in connection with location 03, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What effect would the recent order of the Secretary of Defense to restudy and integrate the communications system have on these various security agency locations?

General SEEMAN. This was approved by the Defense Department and the Bureau of the Budget as a result of a review in connection with the integration of the communications system.

Colonel EPPERSON. At this particular location, 03, it is a joint Army-Navy-Air Force operation as approved by the Secretary of Defense and as far as communications the operation facilities which are a part of this overall package and are going under construction this year do contain a joint communications facility.

The support facilities in this program for the joint Army-Navy-Air Force operation are to provide the necessary support facilities for the Army as well as the Navy.

436
PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.
DA FORM 1574-R, 1 AUG 57

Mr. SHEPPARD. To what extent are you utilizing existing Army facilities on Okinawa, particularly at Kadena Air Force Base, for this facility?

Colonel EPPERSON. Sir, this program is actually in addition to an existing station here which the Army is now operating at the little installation called Sobe as a one-service operation, but in the interest of unity and economy the Secretary of Defense has proposed the joint operation. These facilities are really the supplementary facilities required to allow this joint operation.

Because of the nature of the operation, the requirement for a large antenna field exists. This is a semi-isolated little area which is more or less a self-contained unit other than family housing and the allied support facilities.

We have explored the use of other available island facilities and we are not duplicating the overall community type facilities or overall depot type or backup support type facilities.

Mr. WESTENBERGER. Utilities, the road network, and so forth pass by this installation. There are no additional requirements for utilities, roads, waterlines, and so forth.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, can I assume that economically you are in a better position under this proposal than by the so-called separation of facilities as originally proposed?

Colonel EPPERSON. Yes.

LOCATION 12, JAPAN

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next is location 12.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

FISCAL YEAR: 1961 | DEPARTMENT: ARMY | DATE: 1 March 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
USASA Location 12	Hokkaido	Temporary	
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Chitose, 4 miles SW	Japan	US Army Security Agency	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Classified		1945	Active

II - MISSION

Classified

* Administrative Agreement

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT	C L A S S I F I E D				
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)					

IV - INVENTORY

	LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED			$	$	$
2. LEASED		1,396*	($ –)	$ 2,325,000	$ 2,325,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF (Except Land Rent)					$ 2,325,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY					$ 2,116,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST					$ 517,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION					$ 2,259,000
7. GRAND TOTAL					$ 7,219,000

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY					PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDS. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDS. 30 June 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
131	26	Transmitter Facs	449	SF	0	2,803	0	2,803	101	0	101	101
141	41	Operations Bldg Addn	451	SF	26,945	5,528	2,617	2,911	115	50	65	65
722	46	Addn EM Barracks	452	MEN	0	768	660	108	1,442	1,346	96	96
811	50	Frequency Convertor Plant	453	KVA	0	600	0	600	215	0	255	255
										TOTAL	517	517
					448							

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

240a

Pg 2 of 2 Pgs

...Army for ...little ...to an ...and ...allied ...the ...cili- ...pass ...liti- ...over- ...more ...large ...you ...alled

Preliminary design for the transmitter facilities, operations building addition, addition to EM barracks and frequency converted plant is 10 percent complete. Design is by the Far East District; estimated design cost is $5,000, $3,000, $4,000, and $12,000, respectively.

What additional land is required for these facilities, and what is the present status of that land?

Colonel EPPERSON. Sir, we have land already under Army control for use in connection with these facilities here.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions on this item?

Mr. SIKES. No questions.

LOCATION 13, ENGLAND

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then we have location 13.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM
FISCAL YEAR 1961
DEPARTMENT ARMY
DATE 1 March 1960

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 March 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
USASA Location 13	England	Temporary	
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Harrogate, 7 miles SW	England	US Army Security Agency	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Classified		1957 (Constr started)	Active

II - MISSION

Classified

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT	C L A S S I F I E D				
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)					

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED		$	$	$
2. LEASED	548*	($ -)	1,439,000	$ 1,439,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF			(Except Land Rent)	$ 1,439,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 2,140,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 327,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 358,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 4,264,000

* US/British Agreement, 11 December 1951, Security of Tenure is for 21 years effective 1 June 55, with provisions for extension.

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY					PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	~~CURRENT~~ PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
141	41	Operations Bldg Addn	455	SF	22,985	2,706	0	2,706	72	0	72	72
811	40	Frequency Converter Plant	456	LS	0	LS	0	LS	255	0	255	255
										TOTAL	327	327

454

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Design for the operations building addition and frequency converter plant has not been started. Estimated cost of design is $4,000 and $12,000, respectively.

240c

Give us some comments pertaining to these items on page 454.

General SEEMAN. These are solely operational requirements, one for additional power adjustments.

In this area the Air Force is the agent for all the armed services and the local country does the construction.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see your agreements have been taken care of.

Colonel EPPERSON. That is right, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions on that?

Mr. LAIRD. No questions.

LOCATION 23

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we come to location 23.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 March 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO
USASA Location 23	Classified	Temporary	
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Classified	Classified	U.S. Army Security Agency	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Classified		New	

II - MISSION

Classified

* Foreign Rights

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT	C L A S S I F I E D				
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)					

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED		$	$	$
2. LEASED	716.39*	($ 0)	0	$ 0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF			(Except Land Rent)	$ 0
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 12,772,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 561,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 2,670,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 16,003,000

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
722	83	2 EM Barracks w/o Mess (156-Man)	458	MEN	0	936	624	312	1,745	1,184	561	561
		Prior Authorization PL 85/241										
141	35	Operations Building Addition	459	SF	0	26,853	26,853	0	784	784	0	164
										TOTAL	561	725

457

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

(See note at top of following page.)

241

37

36

Preliminary design for the two enlisted men's barracks is 100 percent complete and final design for the addition to operations building is 90 percent complete. Design is by the southern district engineer; estimated cost of design is $20,000 and $8,000, respectively.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why is it necessary to have an addition to an operation building that is still under construction? What type of advanced planning is that?

Colonel EPPERSON. Sir, I would like to go off the record, if I may, here a little.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, due to the innovations and advances in the type of mechanical devices involved, you find it necessary to expand your space?

Colonel EPPERSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are you going to be confronted with the same situation at the completion of this contract due to the innovations coming next?

Colonel EPPERSON. Sir, we hope not, but, again, if the operational mission dictates certain changes to do our job and we have to put in more complex type equipment requiring more space, then we would be confronted with the same problem.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let me ask this question: In order to obviate as nearly as you can going into a situation constructionwise that you are presently confronted with, what is the liaison between the people now in this construction field so that you can project whether there will be innovations presenting a similar situation in the next 18 months?

General SEEMAN. From a technical standpoint the DOD communications people are coordinating this. But to some extent it depends on the traffic load. This agency is the housekeeper. This is a combination of this type of an installation plus a big installation of the worldwide Signal Corps service. You will note when we come to page 508 some additional items with regard to the overall requirements, and that is a joint requirement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We are trying to protect the capital investment involved to the greatest extent we can. We all know you are having changes but if there is close liaison you can get a projection into the future. Obviously you have covered it the best you can.

Colonel EPPERSON. This is handled by the National Security Agency, who is the controlling Agency in this thing.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Even if that is true, that Agency should project itself into future requirements to the extent they can.

Colonel EPPERSON. They do, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

LOCATION 90, JAPAN

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next is location 90.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 March 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
USASA Location 90	Brady Air Base, Hakata, Kyushu	Temporary	
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Fukuoka City, 10 miles S	Japan	US Army Security Agency	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Classified		1955	Active

II - MISSION

Classified

* Administrative Agreement

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT	CLASSIFIED				
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)					

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED		$	$	$
2. LEASED	101.91*	(-)	$ 909,000	$ 909,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF (Except Land Rent)				$ 909,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 84,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 25,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 1,018,000

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
131	2	Transmitter Facility	461	SF	0	2198	0	2198	84	0	84	84

460

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Preliminary design for the transmitter facilities is 40 percent complete. This design is by the Far East district engineer; estimated cost of design is $4,000.

247

This is a one-line item. Is it to be assumed that this line item is essential to being integrated with the system in order to expedite your service and its requirements?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir. This is just to provide high-powered transmitters to replace present low-power continuous wave tactical type transmitters.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And they will keep both of them operational, both low and high?

General SEEMAN. I would say the low-power one would be put back into stock.

Colonel EPPERSON. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

LOCATION 177, KOREA

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then we have location 177.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

FISCAL YEAR: 1961 | DEPARTMENT: ARMY | DATE: 1 March 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
USASA Location 177	K-6 Airfield, Korea	Temporary	
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
P-Yong Y'eak, 5 miles E	Korea	US Army Security Agency	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
		New Station	

II - MISSION

Classified

* Administrative Agreement

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT	C L A S S I F I E D				
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)					

IV - INVENTORY

	LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED			$	$	$
2. LEASED		50*	($ 0)	0	$ 0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF				(Except Land Rent)	$ 0
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY					$ 0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST					$ 1,264,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION					$ -
7. GRAND TOTAL					$ -

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
141	1	Operations Bldg	464	SF	0	9,873	0	9,873	180	0	180	180
214	2	Motor Repair Shop & Facs	466	SF	0	6,144	0	6,144	117	0	117	117
722	3	7 EM Barracks w/o Mess	467	MEN	0	420	0	420	400	0	400	400
723	4	Consolidated Mess	468	SF	0	6,500	0	6,500	93	0	93	93
724	5	Bachelor Officers Quarters	469	MEN	0	20	0	20	53	0	53	53
890	6	Extension of Utilities	470	DLR	0	LS	0	LS	421	0	421	421
										TOTAL	1,264	1,264
					463							

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

23 23 23 23 22 22

245

Preliminary design for the operations building, motor repair shop, seven enlisted men's barracks, consolidated mess, bachelor officers' quarters, and extension of utilities is 10 percent complete. This design is by the Far East district engineer; estimated cost of design is $9,000, $6,000, $12,000, $5,000, $3,000, and $21,000, respectively.

Why is it necessary to move this unit to a new location?

Colonel EPPERSON. Sir, we are now operating this particular unit from a very congested area in the northern part of Seoul, a little area called Sic Song-Ni, which does not permit an effective operation. It is right in the populated area of Seoul and the neighborhood has grown all around it, over which, of course, we have no control, and it is not an expansive area to allow for an adequate antenna field.

We have been utilizing very temporary type facilities there for a long time, spending the minimum on maintenance, hoping to be able to move to a more suitable location.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the capital expenditure on the buildings requested on page 463?

Colonel EPPERSON. Of the area we have now, sir?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Colonel EPPERSON. I would say a residual value of probably $150,000. I have pictures if it will help show you the typical areas, how they have deteriorated. Some are the same buildings used during the height of the Korean operation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Those were temporary structures?

Colonel EPPERSON. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And this is permanent?

Colonel EPPERSON. It is semipermanent. It is concrete-block walls, with local Korean cement tile roof on timber trussed rafters. It is a standard type they are using in the improvement program throughout Korea.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions on this item?

Mr. SIKES. No questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Unless there is objection, we will take up the next three items: Location 321, location 321–A, and location 321–B. Please provide a statement for the record for each of those locations.

LOCATION 321

We turn now to locations 321, 321–A, and 321–B.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 March 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
USASA Location 321	Camp Red Cloud	Temporary	
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Uijongbu	Korea	US Army Security Agency	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Classified		1953	Active

II - MISSION

Classified

* Administrative Agreement

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT	CLASSIFIED				
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)					

IV - INVENTORY

	LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED			$	$	$
2. LEASED		4.64*	($ 0)	51,000 (Except Land Rent)	$ 51,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF					$ 51,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY					$ 185,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST					$ 31,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION					$ -
7. GRAND TOTAL					$ -

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY					PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
610	5	Headquarters Bldg	472	SF	0	3,000	0	3,000	31	0	31	31

471

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

(See note on top of page 250.)

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 March 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
USASA Location 321-A	1st Cavalry Division Area, US Army Recreation Center Nr 1	Temporary	
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
P'Aju-Ri	Korea	US Army Security Agency	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Classified			

II - MISSION

Classified

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT	C L A S S I F I E D				
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)					

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED		$	$	$
2. LEASED	3.13*	($ 0)	109,452	$ 109,452
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF (Except Land Rent)				$ 109,452
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 100,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ -
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ -

* Administrative Agreement

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY					PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDS. 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
722	6	.3 EM Barracks w/o Mess (2-32 Man and 1-36 Man)	474	MEN	0	100	0	100	100	0	100	100

473

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

248

250

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 March 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
USASA Location 321-B	Camp Casey (7th Infantry Div Area)	Temporary	
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Tangduck'On-Ni	Korea	U.S.Army Security Agency	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Classified		1953	Active

II - MISSION

Classified

* Administrative Agreement

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT	C L A S S I F I E D				
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)					

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED		$	$	$
2. LEASED	4.36*	($ 0)	56,190	$ 56,190
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF (Except Land Rent)				$ 56,190
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 80,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ -
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ -

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY					PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES IN INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
722	3	2 EM Barracks w/o Mess (40-Man)	476	MEN	0	80	0	80	80	0	80	80

475

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

(See note at top of following page.)

249

447

Location 321, Korea

Preliminary design for the headquarters building is 10-percent complete. Design is by Far East district engineer; estimated cost of design is $2,000.

The headquarters building item at location 321 is sorely needed to provide space for the administrative, staff, and command functions of a U.S. Army Security Agency Battalion headquarters. The temporary facilities now used are badly deteriorated and totally inadequate.

Location 321–A, Korea

Preliminary design for the three EM barracks is 45 percent complete. This design is by the Far East district engineer; estimated cost of design is $4,000.

The item for location 321–A is required to provide adequate barracks for members of a U.S. Army Security Agency Company. Facilities now used are totally inadequate. Some are deteriorated quonset huts; others are Jamesway (tent-type) huts.

Preliminary design for the two EM barracks is 45 percent complete. This design is by the Far East district engineer; estimated cost of design is $3,000.

The project for location 321–B is needed to provide suitable housing for personnel of another U.S. Army Security Agency Company now housed in badly deteriorated, inadequate quonset huts.

Signal Overseas

Now we shall consider "Signal overseas" and insert page 477 in the record.

(The page follows:)

	Prior authorization	Proposed authorization	Proposed funding
Signal overseas	590	806	1,396
Pacific scatter system No. 14	590	490	1,080
STARCOM communication relay station, location 23	0	316	316

PACIFIC SCATTER SYSTEM, JAPAN

Mr. Sheppard. Will you discuss with the committee these overall locations in the Pacific scatter system, explaining (1) their location, (2) what additions you contemplate there, (3) the present status of the equipment for the stations and the stations themselves as to their capabilities, and (4) any possible effect of the new DOD communication directive on this system?

Colonel Sampson. With regard to the locations, at the moment they are classified. We are making an effort to get them declassified. If the chairman will permit, I would like to indicate the locations off the record.

Mr. Sheppard. You may do so.

(Discussion off the record.)

Colonel Sampson. This is a joint communication system directed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to meet the requirements of all three services.

The allocation of facilities within this communication system is determined by the communication organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and not by the Army. The Army is doing it simply for the Department of Defense.

As far as the new communication directive that the Secretary of Defense has proposed, Pacific scatter is one facility that falls within the purview of the principles in that directive.

There have been changes in the technical design of the system througout the year, in most cases to meet the requirements of the Air Force and Navy which have changed, rather than the Army. This is a coordinated approach.

Concerning future requirements, the request in 1961 completes the Pacific scatter system. At the moment no other requests are foreseen.

The equipment for the installations at sites 1 through 11 is installed and in operation. The equipment to be installed in the buildings, for which money is being requested, is in the 1961 program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Insert in the record pages 478 and 508.

53984—60——18

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 March 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Pacific Scatter System #14	Camp Drake	Temporary	
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
	Japan	Signal Corps	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Signal Communications			

II - MISSION Provide highly reliable communication facilities with a reduced vulnerability to interference for use by Army, Navy, and Air Force. In response to approved National Policy, the Joint Chiefs of Staff developed a world-wide plan (DCSM 1167 and 1212) for the employment of Scatterwave Radio Communications. This plan, approved by Dept of Defense, designated the Army as the Management Service to install this type of circuitry in the Pacific area to meet the requirements of all Services. This project is part of the fourth increment of the Pacific Scatter System and involves the installation of a Scatter Circuit between Pacific Scatter System Facility #10 and Pacific Scatter System Facility #14 in order to extend the Pacific Scatter System to the area which will be served by Pacific Scatter System Facility #14.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT					
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	2	32	2		36

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED		$	$	$
2. LEASED		($)		$
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF (Except Land Rent)				$ 0
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 2,799,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 490,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ -
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ -

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)				
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m	
131	9	Modification of Bldg 898 (2nd Inc)	480	SF	0	93,916	90,566	3,350	1,956	1,466	490	490	73
		Prior Authorization PL 86/149											
131	10	Repeater Stations	481	LS	0	LS	LS	0	452	452	0	452	57
214	5	Vehicle Storage	482	SF	0	1,000	1,000	0	23	23	0	23	86
721	2	Barracks & BOQ w/o Mess	483	Men	0	31	31	0	112	112	0	112	83
730	4	Sentry House	484	SF	0	114	114	0	3	3	0	3	84
											0	590	
					21 - 478 - 779						490	1,080	

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Preliminary design for modification of building 898 is 100 percent complete, for vehicle storage 50 percent, for barracks and BOQ 50 percent, and for sentry house 50 percent. Design is by the Far East district engineer; estimated cost of design is $20,000, $1,000, $5,000, and $0, respectively.

Design for the repeater stations has not been started; estimated cost of design is $22,000.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM | FISCAL YEAR 1961 | DEPARTMENT ARMY | DATE 1 March 1960

Preliminary design for modification of building 898 is 100 percent complete, for vehicle storage 50 percent, for barracks and BOQ 50 percent, and for sentry house 50 percent. Design is by the Far East district engineer; estimated cost of design is $20,000, $1,000, $5,000, and $0, respectively.

Design for the repeater stations has not been started; estimated cost of design is $22,000.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM | FISCAL YEAR 1961 | DEPARTMENT ARMY | DATE 1 March 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
ACAN (STARCOM) Communication Relay Station	Location 23	Temporary	
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Classified	Classified	Chief Signal Officer	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
U.S.Army and Department of Defense Communications		New	

II - MISSION

1. To provide communication service in a critically strategic area for U.S. Combined and Joint Headquarters, critical intelligence activities and other U.S. activities.
2. To provide command and administrative support of this Army Command & Administrative Network Communication Relay Station and another Army Command & Administrative Network Communication Relay Station in a different country in the same critically strategic area.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT	0	0	0		0
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	15	204	6		225

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED		$	$	$
2. LEASED		( )		$
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF			(Except Land Rent)	$ 0
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 316,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ -
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ -

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
610	81	Headquarters & Admin Bldg	509	SF	0	3,000	0	3,000	49	0	49	49
811	80	Power Supply - Receiver Site	511	KVA	0	750	0	750	267	0	267	267
										TOTAL	316	316

508

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

Design for headquarters and power, receiver site has not been started. Estimated cost of design is $3,000 and $8,000, respectively.

Surface-to-Air Missile Tactical Facilities

Mr. Sheppard. Next we shall take up surface-to-air missiles tactical facilities.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 March 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Surface-to-Air Missile Tactical Facilities	Various CONUS and Overseas		
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**

II - MISSION

Provide air defense for key installations and major industrial centers in the Continental United States, and for key military installations overseas.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT					
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)					

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED		$	$	$
2. LEASED		($)		$
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 Jun 59 (Except Land Rent)				$ 729,711,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 81,830,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 43,216,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$
7. GRAND TOTAL				$

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	Semi-Perm FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
		Chicago-Gary Defense Area:										
740	12	Exchange Sales Store and Snack Bar	517	SF	0	6,300	0	6,300	168	0	168	168
		Ellsworth AFB Defense Area:										
141	1	Ready Building	518	SF	0	1,099	0	1,099	39	0	39	39
		Washington-Baltimore Defense Area:										
723	9	3 Latrines for Barracks	519	SF	0	1,575	0	1,575	71	0	71	71
		CONUS Air Defense Sites - General:										
149		NIKE-Hercules HIPAR Systems @ 50 Sites	520	Dlr	-	LS	-	LS	13,150	0	13,150	13,150
149		NIKE-Hercules Improvmt Kits @ 28 Sites	521	Dlr	-	LS	-	LS	3,836	0	3,836	3,836
					514							

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

(See notes on page 258.)

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (Continued)

INSTALLATION NAME: [illegible]

DATE: 1 Mar 1960

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)					COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30June59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDS 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
		CONUS Air Defense Sites - General (Cont'd)										
149		Battery Data Link Facilities	522	Dlr	0	LS	0	LS	608	0	608	608
											17,594	17,394
		Fort Shafter, Hawaii:										
141	2	Alert Building	523	SF	0	1,400	0	1,400	176	0	176	176
		Fort Buckner, Okinawa:										
131	12	Van Buildings	524	Dlr	0	LS	0	LS	54	0	54	54
131	11	Defense Acquisition Radar	525	Dlr	0	LS	0	LS	193	0	193	193
											247	247
		Korea										
149	306	Signal Communications Facilities	526	Dlr	0	LS	0	LS	642	0	642	642
149	5	Missile Facilities Complexes	527	Dlr	0	LS	0	LS	2,316	0	2,316	2,316
740	308	Morale, Welfare & Recreational Facs	528	SF	0	LS	0	LS	378	0	378	378
											3,336	3,336
		Europe										
149		Tactical Facilities	529	Dlr	0	LS	0	LS	4,000	0	4,000	4,000
149	6	Fire Direction System Facilities	530	Dlr	0	LS	0	LS	145	0	145	145
212	7	Direct Support Shops	531	SF	0	LS	0	LS	500	0	500	500
721	8	Barracks with Mess	532	Man	0	LS	0	LS	2,655	0	2,655	2,655
					515				TOTAL		7,300	7,300

DA FORM 1674a-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

(See notes on page 258.)

10 45 47 46 5 8 7 6 172 3 1

DA FORM 1674e-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

(See notes on page 258.)

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (Continued)

INSTALLATION NAME: Surface-to-Air Missile Tactical Facilities

DATE: 1 1960

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY.				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO.	LINE ITEM NO.	DESCRIPTION	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO.	UNIT OF MEASURE	Semi-Perm FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l	m
390		Research & Development, CONUS & Overseas Supporting Facilities	553	Mlr		LS		LS	14,285		14,285	14,285
										GRAND TOTAL	43,216	43,216

576

DA FORM 1674e-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

(See notes on page 258.)

Chicago-Gary defense area

Preliminary design for the exchange sales store and snackbar is 5 percent complete. Design is by the district engineer.

Ellsworth AFB defense area

Preliminary design for the ready building is 100 percent complete. This design is by the district engineer, Omaha, Nebr.; estimated cost of design is $2,000.

Washington-Baltimore defense area

Preliminary design for the latrines is 85 percent complete. This design is by the district engineer, Washington, D.C.; estimated cost of design is $4,000.

Conus air defense sites, general

Preliminary design for the HIPAR system and the NIKE-HERCULES improvement kits is 60 percent complete. This design is by Diegert & Yerkes, Washington, D.C.; estimated cost of design is $650,000 and $190,000, respectively.

Design for the battery data link facilities has not been started. Estimated cost of design is $30,000.

Fort Shafter, Hawaii

Design for the alert building has not been started. Estimated cost of design is $9,000.

Okinawa.

Preliminary design for the van buildings and defense acquisition radar is 10 percent complete. Design is by the Okinawa district engineer; estimated cost of design is $3,000 and $10,000, respectively.

Korea

Preliminary design for the missile facilities complexes, signal communication and morale, welfare, and recreational facilities is 10 percent complete. Design is by the Far East district engineer; estimated cost of design is $100,000, $25,000, and $12,000, respectively.

Europe

Current extent of design completed in Europe not available here. Estimated cost of design is as follows: Tactical facilities, HAWK, $200,000; fire direction system facilities, $7,000; direct support shops, $20,000; and barracks with mess, $80,000.

Research and development

Estimated cost of design for research and development facilities is $700,000.

Would you discuss briefly for the committee the present status and deployment of the Army surface-to-air missiles and tell us something of the present status of these various items. Include in this the status of the actual construction on these different sites.

General SEEMAN. This surface-to-air missile deployment which we are dealing with is exactly the same deployment in the United States as was concluded last year. The modifications within conus are essentially small items of additional morale and welfare type of worn-out items of the temporary stations such as latrines or some improvements of the technical and radar capacity of the system to keep abreast of the art and to take full advantage of the range of weapons. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the present status of the so-called HIPAR radar sets for which you are requesting construction here?

Colonel LEE. You want the status of the development?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Colonel LEE. As far as our design, the manufacturer recently furnished the Chief of Engineers the requirements and the Chief of Engineers is halfway through preparing standard plans. He expects to finish the standard plans in June of this year and between June and August he will adapt these to the individual sites.

General SEEMAN. Some items are additions to the height of the towers to do away with the interference from one radar to another. As you know, the purposes of the radars are several and these must all be located so that they mutually support each other and do not interfere with each other.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you need any land acquisition or easements for this work?

Colonel LEE. Yes, on an average we will have some 5 to 8 acres of easement to get. This is due to the RF energy hazard.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the present status of acquiring the land or easements?

Colonel LEE. Until we adapt the standard plans to the individual sites we will not be able to acquire them. The cost of the easements is built in our estimate.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Under the circumstances, the cost factor at the moment is that which has been made in the field?

Colonel LEE. Most of the estimates have to be adapted to a particular piece of real estate.

Mr. SHEPPARD. So your estimate can possibly be increased or decreased as of the moment? Is that correct?

Colonel LEE. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What hardening are you giving to these missile sites in Europe and Korea?

Colonel LEE. Sir, these are field installations and there is no hardening. Some of the equipment has built-in protection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But as we apply the term of hardening that is not effective in this instance?

Colonel LEE. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the status of your plans for the HAWK locations on Okinawa?

Colonel LEE. For the HAWK locations on Okinawa, four are out on bids now or are scheduled to be out on bids and the other four are to go out.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You mean your plans are out for bids or construction bids?

Colonel LEE. Construction bids.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Your plans have been finalized.

Colonel LEE. Yes.

General SEEMAN. They are in this fiscal year's program, Mr. Chairman.

Colonel LEE. In 1960.

General SEEMAN. In 1960 but not 1961.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the basis for the cost estimates for the various HAWK facilities in Europe and what is the status of the base rights for the deployment of this missile?

Colonel LEE. In Europe the cost estimates are based on average cost. They are not based on particular real estate. The base rights

agreement for HAWK is handled by the German Government. The German Government furnishes them and the ones this year are in the 7th Army area and they will go on real estate that is already under the control of the Army.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are you satisfied that this will complete the construction for the HAWK and NIKE-HERCULES deployments?

Colonel LEE. The NIKE-HERCULES deployments have been funded. These funds will complete the HAWK deployment now programed.

General SEEMAN. The HAWK program in Europe is in two increments.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And this one would complete it?

General SEEMAN. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much money has been made available for the NIKE-ZEUS program to date?

General SEEMAN. The NIKE-ZEUS has had no money except for research and development facilities. You will recall there was an item in the program last year involving a switch of a certain part from the Atlantic Missile Range to the Pacific Missile Range. That is proceeding. There still is contained in this program certain construction for radar tracking purposes.

Colonel LEE. $80 million was appropriated in 1959–60.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are your obligations aside from the apportionment?

Colonel LEE. We have apportioned all but $21.3 million. That would be $58.7 million we have apportioned. The $21.3 million is in the Department of Defense for apportionment now, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When this comes to the qustion I asked you about your obligation and the difference, I wish you would put that in the record.

Colonel LEE. All right.

General SEEMAN. We will get the last minute information for you.

(Information requested follows:)

As of April 1, 1960, projects under contract amount to a total current working estimate of $28 million.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the status of your present plans for the Johnson Island test?

Colonel LEE. This is the $21 million we now have in DOD for apportionment, sir. As of this morning we understand that Dr. York is going to approve the apportionment. We do not have this in writing yet.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you have any idea when you will get it?

Colonel LEE. From the latest informal information we got from his office we should get it within a matter of 2 weeks.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I want that answer supplied for the record or for the benefit of the committee as to when that money will be released and I want the answer prior to the markup of this bill.

Colonel LEE. All right, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

On the afternoon of April 1, further informal information was received that indicated a further change of attitude within DOD. This information indicated that the paper to release the construction on Johnston Island had been prepared ready for signature, but at the last minute, was stopped. So at present, we have no information on when this construction will be released.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the status of the proposal you had last year to lease the land at White Sands for this activity?

General SEEMAN. The White Sands lease of a 40- by 40-mile extension has been completely consummated. The annual rental is estimated at somewhat over $269,000.

There have been three test firings so far in 1960, which required the evacuation under the couse lease plan. Forty-five families are involved. The operation has been highly successful.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions upon the item?

Mr. SIKES. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Just what do you propose to do at Johnston Island?

Colonel LEE. We propose in generalities to place a launching facility there to launch JUPITER missiles, which will serve as targets for NIKE–ZEUS when they arrive in the Kwajalein area. The major facilities we will have to build are two launch pads, two gantry cranes, a missile assembly building, a fuel storage facility for the missiles, and then another large item that will actually be for PMR.

Mr. SIKES. What will be the total cost of the construction you will have to build to carry out this program?

Colonel LEE. $21.3 million.

Mr. SIKES. The money has now been apportioned?

Colonel LEE. No, sir; the money is not yet available to us. It is in DOD right now.

Mr. SIKES. The decision to carry on NIKE-ZEUS has not yet been made. How would you justify spending this money?

General SEEMAN. The decision to go into procurement, sir, has not been made. This is solely the R. & D. phase.

Mr. SIKES. It is altogether R. & D.?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Are there any existing facilities that could be used for this purpose?

Colonel LEE. There are no existing launch facilities, sir.

The Johnston Island is completely equipped as far as housing, mess halls, warehousing.

Mr. SIKES. What use is being made of Johnston Island now?

General SEEMAN. It was used as the site of atomic tests. This was one of the base camps used by the Joint Task Force in tests of the AEC over the last several years.

Colonel LEE. It serves only as an alternate stop for MATS, sir. I was on the island about 3 months ago. There are less than a hundred people on the island right now. It is an alternate stop for MATS.

Mr. SIKES If you do not get this money, what will you use in lieu of this installation for your program?

General SEEMAN. If we did not get this money at Johnston it would deny the whole concept of using the facilities of the Pacific Missile Range for this purpose.

Mr. SIKES. If you were not to use the Pacific Missile Range, where would you go?

Colonel LEE. The reason Dr. York is hesitating on giving us this money is that he wants to evaluate very carefully the possibility of shooting longer range missiles from the Vandenberg area to Kwajalein.

Of course, this would be a much more expensive missile than the 1,700-mile missile we would use from Johnston. There are several features that would have to be weighted out here. As of yesterday he

decided, it is our understanding he had decided, that the shorter range missiles from Johnston were more economical.

Mr. SIKES. Why do you not use the facilities at Cape Canaveral for this? They are already in place.

General SEEMAN. This is where we started to plan this 2 years ago and the workload of the Air Force and all the forces that use Canaveral, combined with the need for certain base rights areas in some of the non-U.S. owned Caribbean Islands did not permit us going into that area and it is on this basis that we came to the committee and discussed going to the other area.

Mr. SIKES. Who made the decision that the situation does not merit using Cape Canaveral?

Colonel LEE The actual decision was made by the foreign government's refusal to let us use the islands that were required.

Mr. SIKES. How much of an effort was made to secure the cooperation of this foreign government?

Did you write them a letter and say, "You do not want us shooting these things over your islands, do you?" Is that what happened?

Colonel LEE. No, sir. The State Department carried on negotiations over a period of a year and a half. I would have to go back to the record to give you the details but there were many meetings with the State Department and the people here and also on the other side of the ocean.

Mr. SIKES. Sometimes even the State Department does not make a very earnest effort in matters of this kind. Do you feel the issue is closed, that there is nothing further that can be done, that we are held out of the use of this area just because we got a refusal from one government? We never seem to refuse anything to them. I do not know why they so persistently refuse to cooperate with us.

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir. In this particular item, to go back and reopen that would be tantamount to wasting a certain amount of the work that has now been started on Kwajalein and Johnston in preparation for this program, sir.

Colonel EVANS. I think there is one other aspect, with all due credit to the foreign government involved, this was a local island with certain particular autonomy turned over to the occupants of that island and we cannot lay it all on the foreign government, per se.

General SEEMAN. Local governmental problems in the area prevented our use of the area.

Colonel LEE. One other little point: As a result of this move from Canaveral to Johnston there was no increased expenditure. We saved money in MCA because we got the use of two islands where all the barracks and everything were built. We did not have to build those, although the R. & D. costs went up a corresponding amount but the move was made with the net total the same, the same total cost.

Mr. SIKES. I have the feeling, I regret to say, that this matter deserves further exploration.

I am not convinced this is the only solution or the least costly one. That is all for the moment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The gentleman on my left?

Mr. LAIRD. No questions.

CLASSIFIED PROJECT

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next is the classified project reflected on page 535.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Classified	Classified	Permanent	—
5. NEAREST CITY	6. COUNTIES (If continental). COUNTRIES (If overseas)	7. COMMAND — —	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS

II - MISSION

See Classified Justification page 40.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT		Classified			
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)					

IV - INVENTORY

	LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED			$	$	$
2. LEASED			($)	(Except Land Rent)	$
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF					$
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY					$
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST					$ 3,000,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION					$
7. GRAND TOTAL					$

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY					PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 30 June 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 30 June 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
131		Communications Structures & Facilities	536	LS	-	-	-	LS	3,000	-	3,000	3,000
					535							

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

General Authorization

PLANNING

Mr. Sheppard. We shall pick up the next item having to do with general authorization. The first item is "Planning."

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
General Authorization			
5. NEAREST CITY	6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)	7. COMMAND	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS

II - MISSION

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT					
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)					

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED		$	$	$
2. LEASED		($)		$
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF (Except Land Rent)				$
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$
7. GRAND TOTAL				$

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 19__ f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 19__ h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 19__ k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
		Planning	538									12,000
		Minor New Construction	539									3,700
		Access Roads	540									4,500
		Capehart Off-site Utilities	541									3,300
		Rehabilitation of Sub-standard Housing	542									400
		Advance Land Rental - Ryukyu Islands	543									6,500
					537						Total	30,400

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

As reflected here, how much money have you obligated for planning in fiscal year 1960?

Give me the amount of money involved here.

Mr. NORWOOD. Through the end of February 1960, we had obligated $7 million.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What percentage of your 1962 program will have final plans and specifications with this amount of money?

Mr. NORWOOD. With the $12 million requested in fiscal year 1961 or planning we hope to get preliminary design on every item we propose for fiscal year 1962, when we come to this committee next year at least, and to complete final design on all of the fiscal year 1961 program that the committee is considering now.

In addition, we hope to initiate final design on the fiscal year 1962 high priority items.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pertaining to this item and its involvement, the Chair would like to suggest the rapidity of finalization in your planning here is a very important factor, which I think you understand.

Mr. NORWOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions upon the item involved, gentlemen?

Mr. SIKES. No questions.

MINOR CONSTRUCTION

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall pick up the next item, "Minor construction."

What are your obligations for this program in fiscal year 1959 and 1960, gentlemen?

General SEEMAN. We will provide that for the record, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

Obligations for minor construction in fiscal year 1959 totaled $5.1 million. Obligations for fiscal year 1960 are expected to reach about $5.6 million.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Did you construct any programs in excess of $175,000?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir. Several over $175,000 have been approved. The legal limit is $200,000. All minor construction projects are reported to the committees semiannually.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Insert in the record a list of the facilities constructed in fiscal year 1960 under this program and a summary of your anticipated workload in fiscal year 1961.

(The information requested follows:)

PROJECTS PLACED UNDER CONSTRUCTION IN FISCAL YEAR 1960

Location	Project description	Estimated funded cost
Army Chemical Center, Md	Modify building for automatic data processing equipment.	$103,450
Anniston Ordnance Depot, La	Security fencing	191,445
Fort Huachuca, Ariz	Provide utilities for technical service areas	69,171
	Facility for electronic warfare field vulnerability program.	43,780
	Facility for meteorological support activities	60,355
	Facilities for combat surveillance and target acquisition training command.	41,256
	Facilities for combat surveillance infrared evaluation	50,780
Davison Army Airfield, Va	Pave apron and taxiway	32,755
Ecterdinger, Stuttgart, Germany	Rehabilitation and modification of airfield facilities	54,600

PROJECTS APPROVED AS OF APR. 1, 1960, FOR CONSTRUCTION IN FISCAL YEAR 1960

U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y.	Construct waterline from Camp Buckner to Camp National Bridge.	$63,700
	Rehabilitation of electric system in 11 sets of family quarters.	49,639
Fort Belvoir, Va	Construct operational facilities for 30th Topo Battalion.	174,000
Walter Reed Army Medical Center	Addition to mouse breeding colony	197,300
	Addition to X-ray building	76,450
Richmond Quartermaster Depot	Convert warehouse to administrative space	110,813
Fort Benning, Ga. (Black Farm Rangar Camp).	Construct water system, storage and distribution	46,000
	Construct EM mess for 500 capacity	80,428
	Construct 80-man EM barracks	46,572
Fort Myer, Washington, D.C	Increase Electric Power Supply for quarters 4 through 17.	30,050
Fort Knox, Ky	Acquisition of electric substation	53,558
Hunter Liggett Military Reservation	Construct 12 ammo igloos	102,000
	Construct hangar building for aircraft	130,000
	Extend utility lines to airfield	37,000
	Construct fire and crash truck emergency station	40,000
Fort Richardson, Alaska	Construct aircraft control tower	133,000
Hesse, Germany	Improve ammo storage facilities	92,000
Baumholder, Germany	Construct 2 hangars	127,000
Bad Kreuznach, Germany	Construct airfield facilities	100,000

PROJECTS PLANNED OR UNDER CONSIDERATION FOR CONSTRUCTION IN FISCAL YEAR 1960

Fort Detrick, Md	Convert and rehabilitation building S-428 for animal holding space.	$80,000
	Modify building S-525 for laboratory physical studies division.	185,000
Granite City Engineer Depot, Ill	Convert warehouse to maintenance shop	69,657
Diamond Ordnance Fuse Laboratories, Washington, D.C.	Facility for pulsed nuclear reactor	150,000
Letterkenny Ordnance Depot	GM and heavy rocket surveillance facility	174,500
Redstone Arsenal, Ala	Missile signature and electromagnetic emission research facility.	160,000
Blue Grass Ordnance Depot	Construct building to house deactivation furnace	35,000
Savanna Ordnance Depot	do	67,000
Fort Lee, Va	Construct new highway entrance	168,858
Yuma Test Station, Ariz	Construct facilities for airborne	137,500
Fort Huachuca, Ariz	Extension to water distribution system	165,000
	Construct field test system for vehicles	150,000
Fort Leavenworth, Kans	Construct basement in building 136, Midway Relay Station.	164,590
Fort Eustis, Va	Construct transportation school aviation facilities	105,000
Fort Bragg, N.C	Install voltage regulator	90,000
Fleigerherst, Kaserne Hanau, Germany.	Construct helicopter taxiways	175,000
Pirmasens, Germany	Expand storage facilities (Cave 7221)	87,000
Korea	Troop facilities, compounds Nos. 68 and 23, 1st Cavalry Division.	32,000
	Troop facilities, compounds Nos. 80 and 29, 1st Cavalry Division.	50,000
	Troop facilities, compound No. 81, 1st Cavalry Division.	4,000
	Troop facilities, compound No. 88, 1st Cavalry Division.	54,000
	Troop facilities, compound No. 27, 1st Cavalry Division.	48,000
	Troop facilities, compound No. 15, 1st Cavalry Division.	38,000

PROJECTS PLANNED OR UNDER CONSIDERATION FOR CONSTRUCTION IN FISCAL YEAR 1960—Continued

Location	Project description	Estimated funded cost
Korea	Troop facilities, Nos. 82 and 66, 1st Cavalry Division	$56,000
	Troop facilities, compound No. 77, 1st Cavalry Division.	79,000
	Troop facilities, compound Nos. 83 and 67	38,000
	Troop facilities, compound Nos. 37, 85, and 87, 1st Cavalry Division.	16,000
	Troop facilities, compound No. 8, 1st Cavalry Division	20,000
	Troop facilities, No. 38, 1st Cavalry Division	25,000
	Troop facilities, No. 37, 1st Cavalry Division	27,500
	Troop facilities, No. 32, 1st Cavalry Division	133,500
	Troop facilities, Camp Kaiser, 7th Infantry Division	77,000
	Troop facilities, Camp Hovey, 7th Infantry Division	27,000

FISCAL YEAR 1961 MINOR CONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS

Since these funds are limited for urgent construction requirements not specifically authorized, projects cannot be listed at this time. Experience indicates that minimum funding requirements will be approximately $3.7 million.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions upon the item?

Mr. SIKES. No.

ACCESS ROADS

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is access roads.

List for the record the access roads involved in this program.

Last year the committee called for a review of the access road program.

What have you done in this respect, gentlemen?

Mr. WESTENBERGER. This program has been reviewed. Certifications are made that roads in this program are essential to the national defense. We are keeping within the access roads area under general authorization those projects which are of use to the public as differentiated from purely military roads.

We may have, for instance, a surface-to-air missile site that has a road for its own requirement; it is then a part of the project cost, but if the road is one used by the public, a thoroughfare, we have it under this general authorization. We have for your consideration this year this total amount of $41½ million on access roads. Coordination with the Bureau of Public Roads is effected after certification has been made by the Department of Defense as to necessity in the interest of national defense. The road for Benning totals about $2.8 million. For REDSTONE, which is the second increment, $622,000. This REDSTONE road ties into the line item this committee reviewed the other day, where we had an on-post road.

The first increment off post was for the rights-of-way easements, et cetera. This increment is for the actual constructitoin, which has been withheld until we receive funding approval for the on-post portion.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you did not construct any roads in fiscal year 1960 which you did not list for the benefit of the committee and as reflected on page 384 of last year's record?

Mr. WESTENBERGER. I was in effect providing you with the list as I understand you would like to have for our 1961 program. The access roads which have been listed to the Bureau of Public Roads for starts in fiscal year 1960 will be itemized for the record.

(Information requested follows:)

FISCAL YEAR 1960 ACCESS ROAD PROGRAM

Those items listed on page 384 of last year's hearings have been placed under construction or are planned for execution in fiscal year 1960 except the access road for Fort Benning, Ga. The total requirement for Fort Benning including the portion listed for fiscal year 1960, is reflected in this fiscal year 1961 program. Additional certifications, a part of the approximately $5 million worth of projects mentioned on page 384, have been made for new starts in fiscal year 1960 as funding permits. A list of these follows:

Access road certifications

Tactical facilities:	*Estimated cost*
BD–50	$26,010
HA–36	301,370
Fort Huachuca, Ariz	102,000
Fort Monroe, Va	91,800
Rio Vista, Calif	29,820

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is correct.

Mr. WESTENBERGER. Fort Allen, in Puerto Rico, $96,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You can place the balance in the record, if you will. Questions upon that item?

Mr. SIKES. No.

(Information requested follows:)

Access roads, fiscal year 1961, MCA

	Estimated cost
Fort Benning, Ga	$2,770,000
Redstone Arsenal, Ala (2d increment)	620,000
Fort Allen, P.R	100,000
U.S. Military Academy, New York	400,000
Yuma Test Station, Ariz	280,000
Defense sites:	
PH 23–25	60,000
LI 01–50	230,000
OF 10–60	90,000

CAPEHART UTILITIES—CAPEHART HOUSING

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up "Capehart utilities—Capehart housing."

I wish you would insert in the record a tabulation which will show the utilities cost broken down by the Capehart housing projects in this program.

(The information requested follows:)

Capehart housing support costs

Location	Number of units	Preliminary cost estimate
Fort Huachuca, Ariz	100	$100,000
Fort Eustis, Va	275	275,000
Fort Meade, Md	400	400,000
Fort Ritchie, Md	60	60,000
Fort Campbell, Ky	500	500,000
Fort Rucker, Ala	498	498,000
Fort Sill, Okla	350	350,000
Fort Lewis, Wash	500	500,000
Fort Ord, Calif	500	500,000
Fort Buchanan, P.R	100	100,000

REHABILITATION OF SUBSTANDARD HOUSING

Mr. SHEPPARD. "Rehabilitation of substandard housing." Insert in the record a list of the locations of the substandard housing to be rehabilitated with funds presently being requested.

(The information requested follows:)

It is planned to utilize the $400,000 requested to rehabilitate inadequate housing as far as it will go at the following locations:

Fort Belvoir, Va.
Picatinny Arsenal, N.J.
Hunter Liggett Military Reservation, Calif.
Fort Mason, Calif.
Fort Leavenworth, Kans.
Fort Jackson, S.C.
Fort Hayes, Ohio
Fort Meade, Md.
Fort Slocum, N.Y.
Columbus General Depot, Ohio.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When are you going to complete this program, gentlemen?

General SEEMAN. This program is connected with the requirement to demolish or dispose of substandard housing of this category by the end of fiscal year 1961.

In the authorizing act of this year, there is language to permit extension of this period for 6 months to provide us with somewhat more time in which to do this at selected installations.

There is a great problem here, Mr. Chairman, in that many of these substandard quarters are just not worth bringing up to adequate standards. We are following up on the program of demolishing substandard quarters and will complete that by the date limit.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you.

ADVANCE LAND RENTAL

The next item has to do with advance land rental. I wish you would discuss with the committee in some detail the basis for your estimate of advance land rentals having to do with this location.

General SEEMAN. If I may impose upon your time for a few minutes, perhaps a slight historical review——

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is not an imposition so long as it does not become too lengthy.

General SEEMAN. You may recall the MCA Act for fiscal year 1956 authorized long-term land acquisition and resettlement for Okinawa. The first funds were in a fiscal year 1956 Supplemental Appropriation Act. The figure for land acquisition was $24.3 million at that time. By April 1958, $17.8 million had been allocated under the program, by which a right which was termed "a determinable estate" was acquired. After an expenditure of about $4.7 million, this program was found running into difficulty.

(Additional information follows:)

We are advised that there may be a requirement from the U.S. High Commissioner in the Ryukyus, for additional resettlement payments under authority of Public Law 84–161. An order of magnitude estimate of this requirement is $1 million. If the requirement becomes firm, a reprograming action may be necessary during fiscal year 1961 to enable resettlement payments.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What type of difficulty?

General SEEMAN. Difficulties in working it out with the local people.

Through the rest of 1958 a new solution was sought and which resulted in January of 1959, with the passage of an act by the Government of the Ryukyu Islands Legislature called the Rental Value Stabilization Law. This was worked out by and with the full cooperation and guidance of the High Commission, of course.

As a result of this act, new rental schedules were established retroactive to July 1, 1958, when the previous modus operandi was stalled, in which two types of interests are being approached.

The first is an indefinite leasehold and second, a 5-year temporary leasehold.

The High Commissioner, under the guidance and direction of commander in chief, Pacific, has resurveyed the land required for all of the services—this is all Army, Navy, and Air Force and Marines—to determine their acreages and distribution between the indefinite leasehold type and the 5-year temporary leases.

The long-term land requirements are estimated to be around 53,000 acres. The estimate in 1957, about the time it was initiated, was 48,600 acres. The Air Force and the Navy have gone up somewhat in their estimate. The Army has come down slightly.

Last year the 86th Congress, by Public Law 149, authorized each service to pay the annual rentals on the indefinite leaseholds as well as the temporary leaseholds from O. & M. funds. Prepayments of rentals in excess of 5 years were authorized from military construction funds.

MCA funds of the Army were to be used to pay those leases in excess of 5 years in fiscal year 1960, this was the plan last year, and thereafter until this original $24.3 million authorization and appropriation was exhausted. When the Army fund was exhausted the other services were to pick up the long-term leaseholds through their own MCA, or construction procedure.

This was the DOD implementation of that act of last year and last year we did not include any MCA payments in our funding plans. No new obligation authority was necessary because the funds had already been appropriated and allocated.

On February this year we were advised by the Office of the Secretary of Defense Comptroller that the requirement for advance payment of land rentals for leases in excess of 5 years should be included under this general authorization category which you now see, sir, and this is the basis of our estimate, based upon all this restudying which has been done by the High Commissioner and his staff as to what will be needed in the funding plan of this year.

To a certain extent it revalidates a previous authorization and appropriation, since this six and a half million is a part of the overall total of $24.3 million requested or estimated back in fiscal year 1956, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Section 409 of Public Law 86–149 is permissive with reference to payments in advance. Who made the finding to acquire land in this area and pay for leases 5 years in advance rather than from annual payments from operation and maintenance funds as also is set forth in this section?

General SEEMAN. The determination was made, based upon a study of the High Commissioner with the approval of the commander in chief, Pacific, which was passed up through the Army Chief of Civil

Affairs and discussed and the determination made in the DOD, with the full coordination of Properties and Installations and the Comptroller.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, it was pursued through channels, as it were, for final determination. It obviously rested within the purview of the Office of the Secretary of Defense?

General SEEMAN. Yes.

Mr. WESTENBERGER. The landowner has the option under this agreement on indefinite leases as to whether he wants prepaid rental or whether he wants to take it on an annual rental basis.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The landowner may have that privilege?

Mr. WESTENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Insofar as the permissive application of the law I just quoted, the final determination was made in the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. WESTENBERGER. Yes.

Colonel MOORE. I might clarify that. Under the agreement with the Ryukyuan Government the landowner has an option where we have a long-term interest in his piece of land of making a request for a long-term advance payment.

That is submitted to the Ryukyuan Government. The Ryukyuan Government themselves survey that request and they will approve it only if the landowner requires the money to relocate himself, go into a new business or to maintain himself economically. After the Ryukyuan Government approves that request, then our own Government surveys that request to be doubly sure that it is legitimate. Upon both approvals, then it comes forward to the Department of the Army and through the OSD procedure of review and we will pay the claim from our construction funds in those instances where the advance payment is above 5 years.

We can also get the long-term interest land by payment of an annual rental, if he does not make the request for long-term payment. The annual rental is paid out of our O. & M. funds.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The committee is not questioning the procedure because the law within itself is permissive. We are merely determining here who is the determinating factor insofar as this law is concerned here.

What you have just told us about the procedural requirements having to do with the other governmental faction is undoubtedly a component part of the consideration that ultimately has to be determined within the DOD.

Colonel MOORE. That is right, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is correct; is it not?

Colonel MOORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much money is paid each year on an annual rental basis, gentlemen?

General SEEMAN. We will provide that for the record.

It has not been at a uniform rate, as you can understand, through the restudy and the temporary stalling of actual operations and the fact that within that act they had to make it retroactive to the first but we will provide for the record the actual payments.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do that and also at the same time answer the following question: To whom will these payments be made?

General SEEMAN. We will provide that for the record. It may be many individuals.

(The information requested follows:)

As of our latest report, through December 15, 1959, if all the owners of the privately owned land held in the Ryukyu Islands by the United States requested annual rental only the amount involved under the new United States-Ryukyuan agreement would be $5,840,124.88. Of this amount, the Army's portion would be $2,227,913.45. These amounts are, of course, reduced in relation to the payments of prepaid rather than annual rentals.

The United States pays the indigenous Government of the Ryukyu Islands which executes a master lease between itself and the United States for each installation. The GRI enters into basic leases with the individual landowners involved and pays them their rental upon the signing of these leases.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there questions?

Mr. SIKES. No, sir.

SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM

LOCATION 23 (ASA)

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item we will consider is the special foreign currency program—location 23.

This is reflected on page 545 of the justifications.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1961	DEPARTMENT ARMY	DATE 1 March 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Location 23 (ASA)	Classified Overseas	Temporary	
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Classified	-	US Army Security Agency	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Classified		1957	Active

II - MISSION

Classified

Foreign Rights

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT					
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)		CLASSIFIED			

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED		$	$	$
2. [redacted]	716.39	($)		$
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF (Except Land Rent)				$ 0
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 10,736,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 0
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 3,667,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 14,403,000

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 Jun 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
		Prior Authorization										
		PL 84/161 & PL 86/149										
711	26	114 Family Quarters (Special Foreign Currency Program)	546	Fam	0	244	114	0	5,000	2,234	0	2,000
					545							

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

I wish you would show the committee specifically what you intend to construct at this location, what you have there now and what foreign currencies are available.

Colonel McCarty. As you recall, last year the Congress approved for location 23, 114 family quarters, a dependent school and a commissary, but did not appropriate sufficient funds for these three projects. The reduced amount of money appropriated by the Congress has not been apportioned to the Army.

In the meantime, the Department of Defense is instituting a new procedure which is effective on July 1 this year, whereby we will have a pay-as-you-go system.

In other words, we will exchange U.S. dollars for foreign currencies.

General Seeman. This is in the application of the surplus commodity family housing program under Public Law 480.

Colonel McCarty. In this particular instance the Department of Defense has decided that for this authorized project we will request 75 percent of the requirements in U.S. dollars to be exchanged for surplus commodity funds and the balance will be out of MCA dollars.

So therefore this amounts to $2 million additionally of U.S. dollars which we will exchange for foreign currencies, rather than getting the equivalent of $2 million in foreign currencies in the first place.

Mr. Sheppard. Do you know what is available in foreign currencies?

Colonel McCarty. Specifically, I do not, sir. In the past there has been sufficient available in some countries.

Mr. Sheppard. I wish you would make an inquiry about that and have that supplied for the record.

It is very interesting to know that.

General Seeman. The procedure requires notification by the DOD, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of Agriculture as to the available balances in the various countries.

This particular procedure is to come to you, sir, for MCA dollars which are to be transferred to the Treasury's surplus commodity accounts in exchange for foreign currencies for use by our construction agents.

Mr. Sheppard. We may get a report on this situation at a later date. At the moment we do not have it.

That is why I want you to furnish what is available in these foreign currencies at the moment by whatever source of information you have to get it and make it a part of the record here so the record will have it.

General Seeman. We do not have the information now. It is sizable in this particular country.

(The information requested follows:)

On April 1, 1960, the Treasury Department confirmed that foreign currency in an amount equivalent to U.S.$3,700,000, for the construction of surplus commodity family housing, is available.

Second Army

Fort Knox, Ky.

Mr. Sheppard. We shall pick up the next item having to do with Fort Knox, Ky., on page 169 of the justifications.

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE. 545

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

FISCAL YEAR	DEPARTMENT	DATE
1961	ARMY	1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Fort Knox	Kentucky	Permanent	Ky-3
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Louisville, 29 miles NE	Hardin, Meade and Bullitt	Second US Army	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Armor Training		1918	Active

II - MISSION

CURRENT: USA Armor School; School Troops; USA Armor Board; USA Training Center, Armor; Non-Divisional Units; USA Human Research; USA Maintenance Board; USA Hospital; USA Reception Station; 25th Weather Squadron; Summer Training; Support of Civilian Components; Logistical Assistance & Protection of Gold Depository; Engineer Group & US Army Medical Research Laboratory. LONG RANGE: USA Armor School; School Troops; USA Armor Board; USA Medical Research Laboratory; USA Human Research Unit; USA Maintenance Board; USA Hospital; Non-Divisional Armor Units; USA Training Center, Armor; Miscellaneous Station Complement Units; Support of Civilian Components; Summer Training; USA Reception Station; Logistical Assistance; & Protection of Gold Depository.

*One time cost for easement.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	2042	23,725	3762		29,529
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	3200	21,635	3900		28,735

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	10,352	$ 6,519,405	$ 160,214,381	$ 166,733,786
2. LEASED	156	($ 104,501*)		$ 104,501
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959			(Except Land Rent)	$ 166,838,287
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 8,626,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 6,872,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 131,891,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 314,227,000

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)			
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG. 30 Jun 59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m
215	183	Armament Shop Building	170	SF	-0-	10,843	-0-	10,843	223	-0-	223	223
310	209	Army Medical Research Laboratory	172	SF	31,520	105,000	-0-	105,000	4838	-0-	4838	4838
723	210	Officers Field Mess (600 Students)	175	SF	-0-	12,000	-0-	12,000	435	-0-	435	435
724	56	Bachelor Officers Quarters	177	MEN	194	1,031	-0-	160	8,500	-0-	1,376	1376
										SUB-TOTAL	6,872	6872
		PRIOR AUTHORIZATION P.L. 86/149										
740	119	Post Office	179	SF	0	14,488	14,488	0	421	421	0	421
					169					TOTAL	6,872	7,293

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

(See notes on following page.)

271a

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

(See notes on following page.)

Final design for the Armament Shop Building is 85 percent complete. This design is by Proctor, Ingels & Associates, Inc., Lexington, Ky.; estimated cost of design is $11,000.

Final design for the Army Medical Research Institute is 95 percent complete. This design is by Ralph M. Parsons Co., Los Angeles, Calif.; estimated cost of design is $100,000.

Preliminary design for the officers' field mess is 75 percent complete. This design is by the district engineer, Louisville, Ky.; estimated cost of design is $21,000.

Final design for the BOQ is 50 percent complete. This design is by the district engineer, Louisville, Ky.; estimated design cost is $40,000.

Final design for the post office building is 95 percent complete. This design is by Joseph & Joseph, Louisville, Ky.; estimated cost of design is $21,000.

HISTORY OF PROJECT FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH LABORATORY

Gentlemen, this laboratory has been so called "here again and gone again" in nature as far as the locations are concerned. I wish you would review for the committee the question on this which has seen it go back and forth between the Walter Reed Center and Fort Knox. What is the background as far as Walter Reed Center and Fort Knox are concerned?

General SEEMAN. You are correct, sir, that there was an authorization some 3 years ago for a building of this nature to provide for Army medical research and development. There was a tentative site selection at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center. However, the congestion of that site is well known. Furthermore, there were some operations being carried on at various locations.

There are some health studies at the Army Chemical Center; certain of the medical research and development program is carried on at Fitzsimons in Colorado. A large segment of it was carried on at Fort Knox. There was vacillation as between Fort Knox and Walter Reed as to the proper location for this building.

It has not been restudied and it is concluded that the center of gravity of the requirements can best be met at Fort Knox, and it is on that basis that we take a new look this year and we have come in for complete new authorization and new funding.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Out of the total requirement percentagewise what would you say would be the percentage that had been previously carried on at Fort Knox?

I mean just looking at it from the broad law of averages, if we may.

General SEEMAN. The figure that sticks in my mind is around 60 or 70 percent, in that area of magnitude.

Mr. SHEPPARD. As I recall, it was between 60 and 65 percent.

General SEEMAN. The decision we have worked out with the DOD and Bureau of the Budget in this program is that these activities which are at the Army Medical Center and at Fitzsimons will stay there.

We will use existing facilities at those locations.

(Additional information follows:)

In 1951, the Surgeon General initiated a request for a new building to be constructed at Fort Knox, Ky., to replace the 25 inadequate World War II wooden barracks in which the Army Medical Research Laboratory was housed. In 1952 Congress authorized construction of the building and appropriated necessary funds (sec. 101, title I, Public Law 534, 82d Cong.).

At about the same time the Surgeon General proposed construction of two other laboratory buildings, one at Fitzsimons General Hospital, Denver, Colo.,

for the Army Medical Nutrition Laboratory, and the other at the Army Chemical Center, Edgewood, Md., for the Army Environmental Health Laboratory. After considerable study, representatives of the Bureau of the Budget concluded that the three laboratories should be housed in a single building. A site was selected at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Forest Glen, Md. In July 1955, the Congress appropriated funds for the building at Forest Glen, Md. Upon completion of contract drawings and specifications, the estimate of construction cost exceeded the appropriated funds. Additional funds were authorized by the 85th Congress in its second session (Public Law 685), but the appropriation was denied (H. Rept. 2238, July 22, 1958, 85th Cong., 2d sess.). The hearings in 1958 also brought out the congressional concern over increased centralization of essential medical research in potentially critical target areas, such as Washington, D.C.

The Surgeon General has reviewed the entire complicated history of this project, and he recommends that funds be appropriated for a new medical research building at Fort Knox, Ky., to house the Army Medical Research Laboratory, now situated at that installation.

STATUS OF PLANS

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the status of your plans for this project as of now?

Mr. NORWOOD. Right now the plans for the building to be constructed at Walter Reed are complete; the plans have been transferred to the district engineer at Louisville. He is one-third complete on the adapting of these plans to the Fort Knox site.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, having discontinued and made our determination to go to Knox, then you are going to use what you can under the planning that was previously contracted for and operated under by any people for the plans at Walter Reed?

Mr. NORWOOD. Yes, sir.

We are salvaging essentially all of these plans.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is interesting. What percentage would be adaptable?

Mr. NORWOOD. It is about 90 percent or better.

There are some minor changes in the requirement at Knox because certain utilities and construction features are not needed at Knox that they had to have at Walter Reed and vice versa.

COST OF SITE DEVELOPMENT WORK

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have you personally had a chance to review this situation to the degree you can tell me the difference between land preparation requirements costwise at Reed as compared to those at Fort Knox?

Mr. NORWOOD. No, sir; I cannot.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Could you get it without too much exertion or study?

General SEEMAN. We will check the master plan, sir.

(Information requested follows:)

The comparative cost of site development work for the Army Medical Research Laboratory at Walter Reed Medical Center versus Fort Knox is as follows:

Walter Reed Medical Center	$472,000
Fort Knox	258,000

The problem probably will be that site adaptation at Knox will be somewhat more expensive. It is not centralized as much as Walter Reed is, which your committee and the committees of Congress criticized us for before, of trying to go into too congested an area. This

moving it out may cause a little bit more expensive site adaptation or utilities but the building costs as such should be about equal barring modifications. You put your finger on a very expensive spot. Keeping the users from changing their requirements from day to day, and at the same time give them latitude with regard to developing technology, is a difficult problem.

COST OF CHANGE ORDERS

Mr. SHEPPARD. As long as you saw fit to bring that subject up, it might be well if somebody along the line in both the Army, Air Force, and Navy, in order to be impartial with my comments, might tell the boys to go into what I am going to say is a mental roadblock on change orders. They should make up their mind as near as they can, then go on about their business and forget it. The more you walk into change orders the more you walk into expenditures and cost factors. It is about half of 1 percent. Where is my engineering specialist over here? Is about a half of 1 percent, about the best you ever picked up in change orders on the right side of the ledger? Is that about right?

Maybe I am a little bit restrictive in that percentage but if I am, you tell me.

Mr. NORWOOD. We have noted in our change order experience for the past several years we have been reporting to this committee, that change orders increase the cost of construction, in the order of 2 to 2½ percent, which is within contingency factors employed within the industry.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But you know there are many sins committed under the so-called contingency complex.

Let's use the words "more latitude." I think that would be a better word.

General SEEMAN. Our problem on executing the program is that we cannot exceed the legal limit and therefore we must make allowances for these contingencies below the legal limit. In doing the job for the client, the constructing service is always faced with the problem of satisfying the using service within their funds. While there are certain modifications that come out due to unforeseen changes, foundations, conditions, and so forth, nevertheless there is a definite effort to meet the needs utilizing what they have been allowed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When your R. & E. people are on a job of actually doing your ground exploration, if they do not come up with enough borings and ground testing so that you have to go back into a reshifting, this is basically an engineering fault. Would you agree?

Mr. NORWOOD. We do most of that exploration ourselves. Man is not infallible and land does not always reveal the borings.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Man is not infallible but test holes are better. There is a combination. If you put down a few, you might find underground formation or overlay.

General SEEMAN. You get into the area like the missiles where they have a completion date and they have to consider deployment, equipment, etc., and they want such-and-such base by September 1, 1961, let us say, and then you start parceling out the time for these various things. We hold them off as much as we can, to get this good execution, but we have very serious interstaff squabbles as to what you can do in a certain given amount of time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I grant you that, particularly when you deal with unknown factors, where locations will be, et cetera. We have set up and I will maintain my position with my committee and colleagues, that I will hold still for 30 percent out of the expendable dollar as being in this field. Of the 70 remaining I want an explanation for. I think that is fair across the board.

General SEEMAN. There is no question, if we can bring in some competition, and estimate on the basis of a good set of plans and specifications, we will get more for the taxpayers' dollar.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am sure you will.

REASON FOR NOT CONSOLIDATING CERTAIN ACTIVITIES AT THE LABORATORY

Previous justifications for this Laboratory were based on the Army Medical Research Laboratory, the Army Medical Nutrition Laboratory and the Army Environmental Health Laboratory being consolidated at this location. Do you still propose to make this consolidation at the site indicated?

General SEEMAN. The Nutrition Laboratory is the one which I believe is at Fitzsimons. That is to stay there now, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The others that I have enumerated here will be in the consolidated plan at Knox; is that correct?

Mr. WESTENBERGER. No, sir. The one at the Chemical Center will remain at the Chemical Center. Actually, the Nutritional Lab at Fitzsimons is of a working facility nature. The Surgeon General has concluded it should remain at Fitzsimons. It does not lend itself readily to this Fort Knox lab.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why does it not? One time we are told this consolidation would include this situation here; now we are confronted with somebody's idea it cannot be put on a consolidated base.

This should be over here, and this over there. Give me the basic reason, whether it is the Surgeon General, White House, or the Bureau of the Budget, I don't care.

Give us the reasons. Somebody, when we make changes, has to come up with a reason for it. We walked into this program on a consolidation basis. We obviously feel consolidation was predicated on the previous testimony before this committee. I want to know why this mental acrobatic situation is taking place here.

General SEEMAN. Back in 1952, when the first authorization was considered, the thinking was to combine the research functions of the Medical Corps under the same overhead. A certain set of factors existed at that time. We have a very similar situation in connection with the Food and Container Institute of the Quartermaster General's Command, which he wants to bring under the consolidated headquarters at Natick.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When the record comes down to you, General, and I do not want to pursue it unnecessarily here, to those that are being subtracted from the consolidation concept of its origin, I would like to have definite information conveyed in the record as to why and by whom, and that is all.

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

The construction of a new building to house the facilities of the Army Medical Research Laboratory, the Army Medical Nutrition Laboratory, and the Army Environmental Health Laboratory was suggested by the Bureau of the Budget after completion of their study in September 1952.

At that time the Army Medical Nutrition Laboratory was located in the stockyard area of Chicago, Ill., in technically unsatisfactory facilities. Subsequently, this laboratory was relocated to Fitzsimons General Hospital in semipermanent buildings, which have developed into adequate and well-suited quarters for the work of this laboratory. New construction for this laboratory is not contemplated.

The Army Environmental Health Laboratory is a service laboratory and is not associated with the Army Medical Service research program. Relocation of this laboratory from Edgewood, Md., to Fort Knox, Ky., and consolidation with the Medical Research Laboratory now at Fort Knox, offers no advantages to either organization.

TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION

Mr. SHEPPARD. What type construction is proposed for this installation, especially with reference to the comparability with other buildings at Fort Knox and the use of modern architecture with large expanses of glass, and so forth? What is the story back of that?

General SEEMAN. This is a permanent structure, with all the attributes of a permanent structure. Being a research laboratory, it is to be air conditioned also. Do you have any information on this?

Mr. NORWOOD. Nothing beyond that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are we going to conform with the present architecture?

General SEEMAN. I have no specific information, sir. Normally, one of the requirements is to conform with the type of structures in the area, and at Fort Knox it is mostly of brick. The Department of Defense regulations and criteria on construction provide for adaptations to the type of construction of structures in the area. I know of no large expanses of glass.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I do not know the artistic complex of your A. & E. people doing this job, but I hope they do not get into an Air Force complex and put ourselves in the position of having trouble with the Congress. I think whoever handles this contract had better watch that pretty carefully.

If we find any repetition come out of governmental agencies with that kind of an artistic concept, I am afraid we are going to have some difficulty, gentlemen.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I think you can rest assured it is going to be typical, good Army design, and it will be in harmony with Fort Knox architecture. We will make definite statements in the record to that effect.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Our staff investigators have had a prereview of the planning, and I am going to suggest for the attention of whoever has that responsibility they had better watch this pretty carefully, based upon the information and conclusions that were drawn from looking over the plans and as reflected back here in this special report, gentlemen. That is why I am calling it to your attention.

SQUARE FOOT COST AND FLOOR SPACE

What is your square foot cost here and your square foot of floor space for individuals based on authorized personnel and the present staff requirements? You can put that in the record.

General SEEMAN. Our expert witness has been delayed. I apologize.

(The information requested follows:)

The building will contain 105,000 square feet. The unit cost is estimated at $39 per square foot. The authorized strength of the Laboratory is 265 persons. In addition to the new construction of 105,000 square feet, the Laboratory will continue to utilize two existing buildings with a total area of 31,520 square feet. The total gross area of 136,520 square feet thus provides 501 square feet per individual.

FUNCTION OF LABORATORY

Mr. SHEPPARD. What type work do you propose for this Lab which cannot or is not being carried on in other Government facilities, private industry, or private institutions?

General SEEMAN. The main category of work, and the advantage of Fort Knox as a site, is to follow the individual enlisted man and officer in a combat environment—in a tank, for example. The location of the Armored School and the Armored Center at Fort Knox, with the concentration of troops there, all the way from certain basic training phases on up into their individual tank and artillery firing and their unit training, is an ideal location to get a spectrum of this experience. They hope to be able to influence the designs of hearing radios in the tank, studying the noise and vibration levels in the tank, so that they can improve the quality of the operation and actually the design of the tank, if it goes that far.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have you checked out the availability of other institutions as you have in previous questions I have asked or have you not?

General SEEMAN. This is the only place that this type of work is being done as far as the Army fighting soldiers are concerned.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And you have no other available facilities, and you have checked both as to private and industrial, et cetera?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

LOCATION OF BIOPHYSICS DIVISION

Mr. SHEPPARD. One of the divisions you propose here is the so-called Biophysics Division, which is studying the effect of microwave radiation on man. What consideration have you given to moving this Laboratory closer to basic Signal Corps activities such as the laboratories at Fort Monmouth?

General SEEMAN. I cannot answer that question, sir.

We will supply it for the record.

(The information requested follows:)

Signal Corps activities, including the U.S. Army Signal Research Development Laboratory at Fort Monmouth, N.J., were not considered as possible sites for the Biophysics Division of the Army Medical Research Laboratory to conduct studies in mircrowave radiations because of previously acquired knowledge that Signal Corps installations lacked essential personnel and facilities to support adequately the studies on medical aspects of the effects of microwave radiations. The microwave generators and their operation are only a small part of the project requirements, in relation to the biological measurement of microwave effects. To determine the effect of these radiations on living tissues it is necessary to have a closely associated team, including physicians, physiologists, biochemists, bacteriologists, immunologists, and veterinarians. It was easier and more economical to obtain microwave equipment at Fort Knox than to establish complex medical research capabilities at Fort Monmouth.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you know of any report with reference to this proposal made at the OSD level of Director of Defense, Research, and Engineering?

General SEEMAN. No, sir.

I have no knowledge of any specific report. I do know that this program was reviewed by those individuals.

Mr. WESTENBERGER. It was reviewed extensively but I do not know of a report being published.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would check on the special report because it has been rather recently—I do not mean as of yesterday but it should be available to you people. I wish you would take a look at that report if you will.

General SEEMAN. I am somewhat confused, sir, because normally within the ground forces, the combat type at Fort Knox, high radiation from radars and things like that would not necessarily be involved. It may be in some other areas.

(Additional information follows:)

Further inquiry with OSD revealed no such report.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much of the proposed facilities will be occupied by this Division, if you know?

General SEEMAN. This building is entirely to be occupied by the Medical Research Command.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And how much biophysics will be involved here? All of them, a portion of them, or what?

General SEEMAN. As I understand, the question of biophysics is not involved in this Fort Knox Laboratory. It may be.

Mr. SHEPPARD. At the moment, if biophysics is going to be at Fort Knox, you do not know; is that correct?

General SEEMAN. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Ascertain the answer to the question and place it in the record, please.

(The information requested follows:)

No space in the new building will be used by the Biophysics Division. This Division occupies approximately 9,500 square feet of one of the two existing permanent laboratory buildings at the Army Medical Research Laboratory. It is not planned to relocate this Division into the new structure.

LOCATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL MEDICINE DIVISION

Mr. SHEPPARD. Another division of this Laboratory is the Environmental Medicine Division involving research in cold chambers and the like, as well as arctic or tropical areas.

What consideration have you given to locating this function nearer some area or installation better equipped to handle this work, such as for example the Cold Regions Engineering Laboratory at Dartmouth College in New Hampshire?

General SEEMAN. Colonel Vorder-Bruegge has just arrived, sir.

As a kickoff, I might indicate the Cold Regions Laboratory of the engineers is primarily concerned with construction practices and equipment reaction to the extremely cold weather, and not primarily concerned with the medical aspects of it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have those facilities at Dartmouth and they were predetermined by a request and so conveyed to the committee as I recall it. It was one of the most improved and efficient places of operation that we had in the whole scheme of events. At least that is my impression at the moment. In other words, it was supposed to be the best Laboratory in the world having to do with research and determination of all types of cold.

Colonel VORDER-BRUEGGE. I would like to give as a backdrop to that question that our Laboratory at Fort Knox is responsible for studying the medical problems of the healthy combat soldier in the field. To this end we primarily want this Laboratory where there is a large troop concentration. Studies such as these, dealing with environmental factors, cold or otherwise, in our modern era are conducted by utilizing a team approach, so that one studying the factor of stress due to cold has to assemble a team which includes people trained in various disciplines. These investigators represent various divisions of the Laboratory, and include specialists in such fields as physiology, psychology, pathology, anatomy, and biochemistry.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I know that, my friend, but my point is this: Has this particular institution in New Hampshire been reviewed as to its usability? That is the only thing I am trying to determine, has it or has it not? I know you have requirements and I know what the requirements are because I have had those explanations before. Now, the question is just one: Has the other been reviewed or has it not, and would it fit into the picture or does it not?

General SEEMAN. It has been reviewed and it does not fit into the picture.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why?

General SEEMAN. The Cold Regions Laboratory is directed and designed for the purpose of reviewing construction materials, concrete and asphalt and various other materials, for facilities with regard to their use and reaction in cold regions.

The actual medical approach for the individual is not considered as part of the snow, ice, and permafrost research program.

You may recall at the Cold Regions Laboratory there is a very limited number of military personnel. There is absolutely no equipment thereof the combat range type, and nature of that at Fort Knox such as artillery, tanks, weapons carriers, and things like that.

This is a vital relation for the medical research program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, irrespective of the ability that presently exists at Dartmouth, it is not adaptable under your concept for your workload requirement that you are going to establish at Fort Knox?

General SEEMAN. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It has been reviewed, surveyed, and that has been determined?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Although the cold chambers are equivalent insofar as cold temperature control is applied?

General SEEMAN. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Defense Atomic Support Agency, I understand, presently is in the process of assuming coordination of radiological research to limit duplication with the services. Has your proposal for this laboratory at Fort Knox been thoroughly reviewed by this Agency?

Colonel VORDER-BRUEGGE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Did they approve it?

Colonel VORDER-BRUEGGE. Yes, sir.

SUITABILITY OF FORT KNOX FOR RESEARCH LABORATORY

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then let me ask you with reference to the location of this facility. Do you feel Fort Knox is the location that will

make it attractive for the professional type person, either civilian or military, particularly since so many of your personnel are Medical Corps officers serving 2-year terms and unless outside interests can be provided for them, certainly you have little or a very minor chance of keeping them as permanent career officers. That question again is predicated upon the basis of previous testimony, where we are bringing this kind of professional people into a geographical area, as to whether accommodations that are available here will keep them on the job or is it going to create a personnel problem? Has that been researched and studied along with the rest of your research in this project requirement or not?

Colonel VORDER-BRUEGGE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are you satisfied you will not have to come back here 18 months from now and say "We will have to fix these boys up because they are not staying"?

Colonel VORDER-BRUEGGE. I am satisfied this is the most suitable spot we can pick for this purpose.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why do you take that position? Reviewing other locations where we have had this characteristic develop, comparing that to Fort Knox, and I am addressing myself to the professional type involved, I am not talking about the common denominator of housing and what not, but it is generally understood we have difficulties in this area because that type will not stay in certain locations irrespective of what we may have there. You say this has been thoroughly reviewed and you are satisfied that so far as what is being provided here, you will have no problem in keeping that type personnel.

You have gone into the reasoning and the logic that you have had heretofore and complained. In this instance you feel those objections have been taken care of?

Colonel VORDER-BRUEGGE. Yes, sir. Several factors enter this equation, and the objections you mentioned just now were much more true several years ago than today. First, with reference to the military people, Fort Knox is considered a desirable assignment as far as the military person goes and furthermore, he is provided quarters on the post and does not expect to establish his home permanently in this community. With respect to the civilian workers, several factors must be considered.

For example, in the early years of this laboratory the fact that this was not one of the strongest scientific communities in the country was a disadvantageous factor and it was some distance from town. To combat this, though, these people at the laboratory have established relationships with nearby institutions providing for part-time, night school, weekend courses, and correspondence courses and have gone out of their way to make it attractive to these people to take training and for a man with a master's degree to get his Ph.D. while on the job. This is the most successful laboratory in this regard of all of our research laboratories, so much so that we have in fact had inquiries from our other research laboratories asking how they achieved this and requesting reports on their progress because this has made the opportunities for advancement quite attractive to the career civilian scientist.

The other part of this is a vicious cycle in that once one begins to overcome this lack of a scientific community and begins to get peo-

ple in, when a scientific community becomes established, then it is easier to get people.

Mr. WESTENBERGER. We have 23 Ph.D.'s there now.

Colonel VORDER BRUEGGE. Yes. We have built up an extremely competent scientific community of 114 civilian workers.

STUDIES INVOLVING TROOPS AND EQUIPMENT AT FORT KNOX

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have spoken with reference to the location of this laboratory near Ireland Army Hospital and the troops and equipment at Fort Knox. Just how much work has the Army Medical Research Laboratory done with these troops and equipment at Fort Knox or clinical work in connection with the Army hospital?

Colonel VORDER BRUEGGE. Well, through the years the laboratory has worked with the line people at Knox to varying degrees. It is hard for me to think of a precise measure of this.

General SEEMAN. It has been continuously operating since 1942.

Colonel VORDER BRUEGGE. It has been operating since 1942 when it was established as the Armored Force Medical Research Laboratory, and at that time its service was primarily to solve the medical problems as they pertained to the armored forces.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This question is quite pertinent to the hearings and I think you might give a more definitive answer for the record. If you will insert a more complete answer for the record.

Colonel VORDER BRUEGGE. Yes, sir.

(The following was submitted for the record:)

ARMY MEDICAL RESEARCH LABORATORY STUDIES INVOLVING TROOPS AND EQUIPMENT AT FORT KNOX

The U.S. Army Medical Research Laboratory has since its establishment regularly used large numbers of military personnel at Fort Knox in its medical research program. For example, during the period 1945–46, human volunteer military personnel were utilized to study the problem of heat acclimatization, to establish that men can be accustomed to the high temperatures experienced in tropical and desert environments. Approximately 7,500 soldiers at Fort Knox were used to carry out a most comprehensive study on the dimensions and function of soldiers' feet in 1946. This study was necessary to define accurately the type of shoe that would be most suitable for military purposes. In 1956 this laboratory made a clinical evaluation of the vapor barrier insulated boot using approximately 100 soldiers from Fort Knox. In 1958 approximately 300 soldiers participated in a study of the effects of certain drugs to combat motion sickness associated with riding military vehicles. In 1959, a study was performed upon 350 soldiers (drivers of military vehicles) concerning the development of fatigue. At the present time, a study of an additional 150 soldier-drivers is in process of completion. During the period 1956–59, a large-scale study on hearing losses occurring in soldiers during training at Fort Knox was carried out. More than 500 soldiers were studied to determine the temporary and permanent hearing losses occurring in the noisy environment of gunfire and tank operations. Correlation studies are underway to relate the exact type of hearing loss to the cause, in order to develop measures for the reduction of this hazard and the extensive compensation for disability related to deafness as a result of military service. The U.S. Army Medical Research and Development Command plans to increase steadily the emphasis on investigations of medical problems of soldiers in the field.

CLINICAL RESEARCH ACTIVITIES IN ASSOCIATION WITH IRELAND ARMY HOSPITAL

The U.S. Army Medical Research Laboratory is increasing the coordination of its research program with the staff of Ireland Army Hospital at Fort Knox. Specialized facilities and professional skills of this laboratory are available on a 24-hour-per-day basis for advanced studies on special patients being cared for in the hospital. During the period 1955–57, many patients suffering from diseases of blood vessels in the extremities were evaluated in the cold-room facilities of

the laboratory. The biochemistry division has assisted in the examination of patients with unusual diseases by making determinations of complex substances in the blood and urine, which the hospital laboratory was not equipped to perform. This division has also provided consultants to assist the hospital staff in handling patients with unusual defects in their blood clotting mechanisms. The biochemistry division is working with the staff of the surgical service of the hospital to evaluate commercial blood substitute items. The research laboratory recently devised a procedure for rapid identification of certain antibiotic resistant bacteria, reducing the time required for testing from approximately 24 hours to 6 hours. A trial of the new technique at the hospital indicates the method will materially assist the staff in the control of infections by these microorganisms. Studies are also being made in conjunction with the hospital staff on a number of patients with upper respiratory infections, in order to determine the type of secondary infecting bacteria, with the ultimate goal of developing a new form of treatment. The psychophysiology division has cooperated with the eye, ear, nose, and throat department of the hospital by furnishing facilities for research on the mechanism of hearing. The laboratory has also closely associated with the medical service of the hospital in the study of hyperthyroidism and the chronic alcoholic state in relation to the early diagnosis and treatment of these conditions.

PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH CLINICAL RESEARCH TEAM

Mr. SHEPPARD. Actually, if you propose to do clinical work with the hospital here, is there not a proposal pending at the present time to give the Laboratory additional space on the second floor of the annex to the hospital which will be sufficient to meet this clinical workload? Do you know anything about that pending proposal?

Colonel VORDER BRUEGGE. Yes. I know there is a proposal to establish a clinical research team to work jointly between the hospital and the Laboratory. That has been pending for more than a year. It has not been formalized. Officers from the Research Laboratory presently do participate in hospital activities but the full team is not organized. The formulation of this team and the equipment for it and the precise space in the hospital or area in the Laboratory are not worked out.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would it be reasonable to assume under this proposal and request that if the Fort Knox appropriation request is granted that this proposed second floor annex addition would be eliminated and consolidated?

Colonel VORDER BRUEGGE. An annex to the Ireland Hospital, sir?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Colonel VORDER BRUEGGE. This I would prefer inserting in the record after talking to the people involved.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very well. Supply that for the record.

(The following information was submitted for the record:)

There is presently under consideration a proposal to establish a clinical research ward in an area on the east portion of the second floor of the hospital annex (the old brick hospital building, building No. 1002). This small ward is planned for detailed studies on selected patients, and will be operated as a joint facility by personnel of the research laboratory and the hospital. The Surgeon General appreciates fully the advantages of clinical research programs and he encourages officers to conduct research, especially in Army hospitals designated as teaching centers. Ireland Army Hospital at Fort Knox has been designated to participate in the Army Medical Service training program.

In addition to the usual facilities and services provided on hospital wards, this new ward will be supported by a modern metabolic physiology research laboratory. Studies conducted in this specialized facility supplement, but do not replace, basic operations of the research laboratory or the hospital. The space in the hospital annex is adequate for this metabolic ward, but activation of the facility will not reduce the space requirements of the research laboratory or the hospital.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The committee will stand adjourned until 10 o'clock Monday morning.

MONDAY, APRIL 4, 1960.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

WITNESSES

HON. CECIL P. MILNE, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY (MATERIAL)
REAR ADM. JOHN L. CHEW, USN, DIRECTOR, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE DIVISION, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS
REAR ADM. E. J. PELTIER, CEC, USN, CHIEF, BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS
REAR ADM. LOT ENSEY, USN, ASSISTANT COMPTROLLER, DIRECTOR OF BUDGET AND REPORTS
JOHN J. REED, DIRECTOR, FACILITIES DIVISION, OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY (MATERIAL)
THOMAS J. SMYTH, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO DIRECTOR, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE DIVISION, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS
CAPT. H. C. BRIDGERS, JR., USN, HEAD, AVIATION BASE REQUIREMENTS BRANCH, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS
COMDR. J. V. BARTLETT, CEC, USN, HEAD, PROGRAM MANAGEMENT STAFF, BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS
W. P. TIENCKEN, STAFF TO ASSISTANT CHIEF, BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS FOR REAL ESTATE
CAPT. J. W. M. MONTGOMERY, USN, CHIEF STAFF OFFICER
COMDR. A. P. MINWEGEN, CEC, USN, STAFF OFFICER FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

CLASS 1—SHIPYARD FACILITIES

REAR ADM. R. L. MOORE, USN, DEPUTY CHIEF, BUREAU OF SHIPS
COMDR. J. L. BURKE, CEC, USN, HEAD, NAVY FACILITIES EVALUATION SECTION, BUREAU OF SHIPS

CLASS 2—FLEET BASE FACILITIES

REAR ADM. JOHN L. CHEW, USN, DIRECTOR, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE DIVISION, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

CLASS 3—WEAPONS FACILITIES

REAR ADM. W. E. ELLIS, USN, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF NAVAL WEAPONS FOR FIELD SUPPORT
REAR. ADM. T. F. CONNOLLY, USN, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF NAVAL WEAPONS FOR PMR AND ASTRONAUTICS
CAPT. G. M. GANS, CEC, USN, FACILITIES OFFICER, FIELD SUPPORT GROUP, BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS
M. R. HANABURY, DIRECTOR, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION DIVISION, FIELD SUPPORT GROUP, BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS
LT. COL. J. F. DRIFTMIER, USMC, PROJECT MANAGER, MARINE CORPS AIR STATIONS, BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS

CLASS 4—SUPPLY FACILITIES

REAR ADM. T. A. LONG, SC, USN, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS FOR TRANSPORTATION AND FACILITIES

R. E. PESSAUD, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, SHORE ESTABLISHMENT DIVISION, BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS

CLASS 5—MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

MAJ. GEN. C. R. ALLEN, USMC, QUARTERMASTER GENERAL OF THE MARINE CORPS

COL. "A" "E" DUBBER, USMC, DIRECTOR, SERVICES DIVISION, SUPPLY DEPARTMENT, HEADQUARTERS, MARINE CORPS

CLASS 7—SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES

CAPT. N. D. GAGE, USN, ASSISTANT CHIEF FOR PROPERTY MANAGEMENT, BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

A. P. KENYON, PLANNING OFFICER, SHORE ESTABLISHMENT DIVISION, BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

CLASS 9—COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES

REAR ADM. FRANK VIRDEN, USN, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS (COMMUNICATIONS), DIRECTOR OF NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS

COMDR. T. R. GRAY, USN, HEAD, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION SECTION (COMMUNICATIONS), OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

LT. COMDR. D. D. BUTLER, USN, ASSISTANT HEAD, INSTALLATIONS ENGINEERING SECTION, OFFICE OF NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS

CLASS 11—YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

REAR ADM. E. J. PELTIER, CEC, USN, CHIEF, BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS

COMDR. J. V. BARTLETT, CEC, USN, HEAD, PROGRAM MANAGEMENT STAFF, BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS

Program and financing

	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate
Program by activities:			
Direct obligations:			
1. Public works construction	$324,836,900	$207,025,000	$168,800,000
2. Minor construction	2,913,364	3,475,000	4,000,000
3. Planning	13,077,706	10,500,000	9,500,000
4. Supporting activities	2,566,042	4,000,000	8,200,000
Total direct obligations	343,394,012	225,000,000	190,500,000
Reimbursable obligations:			
4. Supporting activities	2,495,116	5,000,000	5,000,000
Total obligations	345,889,128	230,000,000	195,500,000
Financing:			
Unobligated balance brought forward	−139,101,645	−109,685,118	−88,797,518
Advances and reimbursements from—			
Other accounts	−643,368	−3,000,000	−3,000,000
Non-Federal sources (50 Stat. 888; 42 U.S.C. 1401–1430)	−1,851,748	−2,000,000	−2,000,000
Recovery of prior year obligations	−18,977,485		
Unobligated balance carried forward	109,685,118	88,797,518	88,297,518
Appropriation (new obligational authority)	295,000,000	204,112,400	190,000,000

Object classification

	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY			
Total number of permanent positions	3,274	3,105	3,039
Average number of all employees	2,774	2,777	2,680
Number of employees at end of year	2,830	2,774	2,606
Average GS grade and salary	7.3 $6,125	7.3 $6,149	7.3 $6,173
Average salary of ungraded positions	$4,210	$4,280	$4,340
Personal service obligations:			
Permanent positions	$16,268,376	$16,285,000	$15,853,000
Other personal services	432,157	505,000	473,000
Total personal service obligations	16,700,533	16,790,000	16,326,000
Direct obligations:			
01 Personal services	14,946,789	14,489,000	14,189,000
02 Travel	636,710	635,000	455,000
03 Transportation of things	1,315,888	1,000,000	900,000
04 Communications services	95,708	95,000	95,000
05 Rents and utility services	210,846	204,000	200,000
06 Printing and reproduction	350,390	350,000	225,000
07 Other contractual services	4,446,463	3,000,000	2,480,000
Services performed by other agencies	67,221	70,000	70,000
Private foreign labor contracts [1]	198,358	143,000	143,000
08 Supplies and materials	12,977,879	10,000,000	8,500,000
09 Equipment	21,724,730	14,000,000	10,000,000
10 Lands and structures	284,647,141	175,751,646	151,386,000
11 Grants, subsidies, and contributions	669,326	665,000	650,000
15 Taxes and assessments	11,585	8,000	7,000
Total direct obligations	342,299,034	220,410,646	189,300,000
Reimbursable obligations:			
01 Personal services	1,753,744	2,301,000	2,137,000
02 Travel	79,351	171,640	170,000
07 Other contractual services	589,062	2,427,360	2,620,000
Private foreign labor contracts [2]	72,959	100,000	73,000
Total reimbursable obligations	2,495,116	5,000,000	5,000,000
Total Navy	344,794,150	225,410,646	194,300,000
ALLOCATION ACCOUNTS			
Total number of permanent positions	11	17	6
Full-time equivalent of all other positions	1	1	1
Average number of all employees	11	14	6
Number of employees at end of year	6	4	4
Average GS grade and salary	7.3 $6,125	7.3 $6,149	7.3 $6,173
01 Personal services:			
Permanent positions	$49,590	$66,084	$25,200
Positions other than permanent	4,240	4,500	4,500
Other personal services	512	916	300
Total personal services	54,342	71,500	30,000
02 Travel	6,132	7,542	6,000
03 Transportation of things	74	100	100
04 Communications services	170	330	100
05 Rents and utility services	1,121	1,100	1,100
06 Printing and reproduction	483	500	500
07 Other contractual services	33,810	82,505	3,000
Services performed by other agencies	19,155	50,000	50,000
08 Supplies and materials	288	372	
09 Equipment	804	2,356	
10 Lands and structures	976,874	4,368,749	1,107,500
11 Grants, subsidies, and contributions	1,619	4,200	1,600
15 Taxes and assessments	106	100	100
Total allocation accounts	1,094,978	4,589,354	1,200,000
Total obligations	345,889,128	230,000,000	195,500,000
Obligations are distributed as follows:			
Navy	344,794,150	225,410,646	194,300,000
Army	186,212	546,732	
Department of Commerce (Bureau of Public Roads)	894,933	4,042,622	1,200,000
Federal Aviation Agency	13,833		

[1] Average number of persons: 1959, 87; 1960, 65; 1961, 65.
[2] Average number of persons: 1959, 19; 1960, 20; 1961, 20.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Gentlemen, we shall now take testimony from the Navy on its requirements.

Mr. Secretary, do you have a statement you wish to present to the committee?

Mr. MILNE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You may proceed and we will not interrupt you until you have completed your statement.

STATEMENT OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY (MATERIAL)

Mr. MILNE. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am happy to be present to support the request of the Department of the Navy for $190 million in new obligational authority for fiscal year 1961 for the appropriation "Military construction, Navy."

This is a tight program; one which has been carefully reviewed and which represents our minimum requirement. We are seeking funds for only those items which are believed to be absolutely essential.

Included within our program is a request for funds to support 3,790 units of Capehart family housing. We have screened this requirement carefully. Housing is important to our personnel, but we believe it must be placed in proper relationship and balance with other military requirements. Most of our new housing is being built under the Capehart Act, funded by mortgages of at least 25 years, which must be paid for by future Navy appropriations. Also, such additions to our housing inventory increase the demands on our operating and maintenance funds. Bearing this in mind, as well as the fact that technological advances have caused and will cause changes in the Shore Establishment, the Navy has been conservative in programing additional housing. We are continuing the policy of requesting housing primarily in those areas where there is a minimum of community support in relation to the size of the housing requirement.

As the number of units in our inventory increases, we recognize the necessity to be as effective as possible in our management of this asset. To do this, we are preparing a plan to establish a central housing management organization in the Bureau of Yards and Docks which will be responsible for maintenance of all housing in the Navy. This organization will have authority and responsibility for the setting of standards of maintenance, the actual maintenance itself, and will give, through proper accounting procedures, controls over the moneys which are being expended.

Other Navy witnesses will discuss with you the details of our appropriation request. I would like to address myself briefly to other actions which are being taken to improve our management of facilities.

We have, in the past year, instituted several important new techniques. At the same time, we continue to conduct reviews of the Shore Establishment in an effort to effect realistic reductions and consolidations of activities, consistent with the need to support the fleet.

As an illustration of our improved management, the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations has recently issued a 5-year construction plan for the worldwide Shore Establishment. This will bring greater realism into our long-range planning because it sets limits imposed by

firm, known requirements for each activity. These limits allow flexibility, yet eliminate unrealistic planning which can occur when there are no definite guidelines.

Another management tool, recently developed, is a technique of reviewing assets and matching them against requirements within a given geographical complex without regard to the individuality of the various smaller command or bureau installations within the area.

This is called the multiple activity master plan, and we are using it to achieve better utilization of our facilities by the consolidation of the requirements of neighboring activities and by a cross-utilization of existing facilities among the various field operations.

Last year it was stated that the Navy was looking toward establishing a uniform system of reporting costs of maintenance of the Shore Establishment. Specifically, the system concerns the cost of maintenance of all real property and of maintenance and operation of utility systems owned by the Navy. This system would supply criteria for measuring maintenance performance of management bureaus and provide replacement criteria. We have taken the preliminary steps to install the reporting procedures for the system and have decided on the required cost-reporting classifications to be used by the Shore Establishment effective with fiscal year 1961. By the end of fiscal year 1961, we will have knowledge of the actual cost of maintenance of all real property in greater and more meaningful detail than under the present classifications. We will then begin the development of standards and replacement criteria on an overall basis.

In the field of real property management, we have improved the procedures for reviewing our need for continued utilization of existing assets and have shortened the disposal process. As an illustration of our continuing efforts in this field, we have recently completed a joint survey with the Department of Defense of our land holdings in the State of Hawaii. We have determined that we will be able to release in the near future about 2,100 acres for which we no longer have a requirement. The streamlining of our procedures made it possible to report, during the last calendar year, 112 properties containing over 127,000 acres and having an acquisition cost of approximately $453 million as excess to our requirements.

I would like to mention briefly a matter which has been of interest in the past. This concerns the subsidence problem at the Long Beach Naval Shipyard. We have received substantial evidence that the subsidence has been arrested as a result of the repressurization efforts currently underway in that area. Appropriate technical and legal evaluations of the programs undertaken to prevent further subsidence have concluded that the Government's interests are adequately protected. Accordingly, the Secretary has made the official determination under Public Law 685 of the 85th Congress, approved August 20, 1958, that sufficient action has been taken or arrangements made to arrest further subsidence of the shipyard. This determination, made on March 10, 1960, satisfies the statutory restrictions placed upon the previously authorized items of construction required at the shipyard for protective and remedial purposes.

In my statement last year, I mentioned that we were studying the feasibility of centralizing the public works efforts in large naval complexes.

In July of last year, this was started at Newport, R.I. It has worked out so successfully that we are putting similar plans into effect in Guam, Pearl Harbor, and Subic Bay, Philippines, on July 1 next. Two others—namely, Norfolk, Va., and Guantanamo Bay, Cuba—will be put into operation before January 1, 1961.

A subject which has been of continuing interest to the committee concerns minor construction, both the repair and improvement aspects. This is perhaps the best place to clarify the Navy's position on this matter and to inform the committee of the procedures followed to manage this segment of our construction program.

The terms "repair" and "minor construction" are highly technical, and I feel it necessary to explain how these are currently defined.

Repair: The restoration of a facility to a condition substantially equivalent to its original or designed capacity and efficiency by replacement, overhaul, or reprocessing of constituent parts or materials.

Minor construction: Any construction (except family housing) costing $200,000 or less, which is to be accomplished under the authority of 10 U.S.C. 2674. The construction may be permanent or temporary and may include acquisition or construction of new facilities as well as conversion, alteration, extension, relocation, or rearrangement in existing facilities to enhance structural strength, stability, safety, or usefulness.

The greatest difficulty concerns those projects which are authorized by 10 U.S.C. 2674. This standing authorization requires us to use military construction funds, as appropriated, for those projects which exceed $25,000; for those projects less than $25,000 O. & M. funds may be used and the Navy follows this practice. The limitations applied by law are as follows:

(*a*) No single project can exceed $200,000.

(*b*) The Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations) approves projects from $50,000 to $200,000.

(*c*) The Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Material) approves projects from $25,000 to $50,000.

(*d*) The bureau chiefs approve projects up to $25,000 and may delegate, to the field, authority up to $5,000.

The most confusion in this area is caused by so-called combined repair and minor construction projects. This type of project is one where there is a clear distinction between the repair part and the minor construction part; that is, the parts are severable, not intermingled. It has been necessary only to obtain approvals within the above-stated limitations for the minor construction part. Thus, a project looked at in total could appear to exceed the legal limits spelled out in 10 U.S.C. 2674 when, in fact, the minor construction part was within the approval limits dictated by law.

We recently concluded an administrative review within the Navy designed to evaluate the application of O. & M. funds under the provisions of "minor construction authority" as set forth in 10 U.S.C. 2674 as against selected projects. While we found no patent abuse of the authority, it was demonstrated that clearer definitions were needed to distinguish items of repair, chargeable to O. & M. appropriations, from minor construction projects coming within the scope of 10 U.S.C. 2674 also chargeable to O. &. M. This review made it obvious that we should tighten departmental control of combination-type projects.

We are currently in the process of refining our technical definitions covering these items and also establishing procedures whereby each proposed project will be reviewed in its total concept, so that the breakdown between the repair and minor construction portions will receive simultaneous review.

Our procedures are going to be revised so that this control is exercised from the departmental level, and it is anticipated that this will do much to clarify the matter and to bring more effective management to bear upon the expenditure of O. & M. funds for repair purposes. In additional, we intend to establish a periodic audit-type report which will serve to bring this information to the attention of top level management.

Finally, we have recently taken action to insure compliance with minor construction regulations by requesting the comptroller organization to include an evaluation of minor construction among its regular audit activities.

I wish to thank you for the privilege of appearing before the committee.

STATEMENT OF DIRECTOR, SHORE STATION CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE DIVISION, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

Admiral CHEW. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the privilege of appearing again before this committee. I should like to take this occasion to discuss briefly the Navy's requirements for military construction.

Many technological improvements have been made in our ships, aircraft, weapons, and equipment over the past few years. These improvements have increased the sea-keeping qualities and the striking power of the fleet. By the same token, they have created new and added requiremeints for support of the fleet by the Naval Shore Establishment.

To realize the full potential of our continually improving operating forces, the supporting shore facilities should be kept abreast of this progress. This concept demands well-coordinated, long-range planning. I believe our planning system now in effect qualifies in this respect.

One of the products of this thoughtful, integrated planning is our annual military construction program. The Navy has very many specific requirements for modern shore facilities. We attempt to phase these improvements into our shore stations at the time they are needed. However, the total Navy budget is composed of a number of important components which are balanced to meet the most essential needs. Among these integrated parts the military construction program is relatively small. Consequently, each project in it must be selected most carefully. Only those projects which can satisfy our most urgent requirements are able to withstand the critical review imposed on the program by the Navy, the Department of Defense, and the Bureau of the Budget.

We are recomending new obligational authority in the amounts of $190 million for the regular program and $3 million for commodity credit family housing for accomplishment of the Navy's fiscal year 1961 military construction funding program. This program is composed of the following parts: $118,447,000 for projects proposed for

new authorization; $25,800,000 for amendments to prior authorizations; $23,480,000 for projects authorized in prior years; and $25,500,000 for funding continuing authorizations.

One of the projects proposed for new authorization is at the Naval Station, Washington metropolitan area, in the amount of $13,320,000. It was excluded from H.R. 10777, the military construction authorization bill passed by the House of Representatives on March 9, 1960, on the basis that a firm site had not been approved for its establishment. However, the House Armed Services Committee assured the Navy that the omission was without prejudice, and that the project would be considered for restoration to the program if the National Capital Planning Commission and the Bureau of the Budget should approve a specific site. Both of these agencies have approved the location for the naval station at the northern end of the Naval Air Station, Anacostia. This is basically the site originally planned by the Navy.

The various line items in the program being considered by the committee are geared to provide support of the following objectives:

1. Fleet operations	$138,227,000
(a) Carrier strike force	34,239,000
(b) Antisubmarine warfare	12,484,000
(c) Continental air defense	462,000
(d) Training	17,837,000
(e) Logistics	73,205,000
2. Marine Corps	9,032,000
(a) Air forces	4,021,000
(b) Ground forces	5,011,000
3. Guided missiles	17,930,000
(a) POLARIS-fleet ballistic missiles	11,580,000
(b) Pacific Missile Range	6,350,000
4. Research, development, test, and evaluation	28,038,000
Total	193,227,000

Details of each item are contained in the program books provided members of the committee. The line items are grouped in eight facilities classes, each of which is sponsored by a separate bureau or office of the Navy, including the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations and the Marine Corps. The following is a summary of the amounts in the program under each of these classes:

1. Shipyard facilities	$17,772,000
2. Fleet base facilities	7,177,000
3. Naval weapons facilities	55,767,000
4. Supply facilities	842,000
5. Marine Corps facilities	5,011,000
6. Service school facilities	24,243,000
7. Communication facilities	45,968,000
8. Yards and docks facilities	36,447,000
Total	193,227,000

Each of the class sponsors has a prepared statement. If I may have the chairman's permission, I shall insert the appropriate statement in the record at the start of my testimony on each facilities class.

Statement of Chief of Bureau of Yards and Docks

Admiral Peltier. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am Rear Adm. E. J. Peltier, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks. This Bureau, as you know, has technical responsibility for the acquisition, construction, maintenance, and disposal of the Shore Establishment of the Navy. In preparing the budget for the construction program, the Bureau of Yards and Docks, supported by its 15 district public works offices, is responsible for the preliminary engineering which determines both the type of construction and the estimated cost of the projects.

The backbone of our organization, both Bureau and field, is composed of the Civil Engineer Corps supported by civilian technical experts. This permanent organization, like that of the other bureaus, is composed of a relatively small nucleus of professional people whose main purpose is administrative and technical guidance. For most of the facility design, we depend, as do the other bureaus in the case of weapons, on private industry. The quality and economy of the end product therefore depend on careful selection of architectural-engineering firms. Construction, on the other hand, is based not on selection but on competitive bidding, on the basis of complete construction drawings and specifications. Our main concern, therefore, after awarding the construction contract to the lowest bidder, is to see that the work is done in strict accordance with the specifications. To that end our administrative effort is directed essentially toward the inspection of construction.

As managers of the Navy's portion of the military construction appropriation, we are also accountable for previously authorized programs and the funds appropriated to support them. A few years ago there existed an imbalance of several hundred million dollars between authorization and appropriation because of the gradual accumulation of unfunded authorization. As the result partly of the repealer clause in recent authorization acts, and partly of appropriations more closely matching authorizations, the imbalance has been reduced so that at the end of fiscal year 1960 we will have only about $75 million of unfunded projects, and at the end of fiscal year 1961, the year with which the current hearings are concerned, the estimated unfunded authorization will be reduced to less than $30 million.

As regards obligations versus available appropriation, I should like to emphasize, as I did last year, the fact that we always carry from one fiscal year into the next a substantial amount of unobligated appropriation, which, when added to the new obligation authority, tends to give a false impression of the magnitude of our available cash. This yearly carryover, always substantial but varying with the size of the construction program underway, is unavailable insofar as our ability to start new line items is concerned. All of it is committed to complete line items already started. It will be used for additional contract awards, inevitable change orders under contracts already awarded, occasioned by such things as unforseen underground and site conditions as well as design changes and improvements, the procurement and installation of collateral equipment, and the cost of administration and inspection.

This yearly carryover is in compliance with existing law. As applied to military construction, it requires that no new line items may

be started unless there are reserved sufficient funds for obligations required to complete work in progress. At the end of fiscal year 1960 it will amount to about $89 million. This is a reduction from $110 million in fiscal year 1959 and $139 million in fiscal year 1958. This reduction reflects the decreasing size of the program in recent years.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Statement of Assistant Navy Comptroller, Director of Budget and Reports

Admiral Ensey. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is again a privilege to present the Department of the Navy's estimates for its "Military construction, Navy and Military construction, Navy" (special foreign currency program) appropriations for fiscal year 1961.

As Admiral Chew has said, we are requesting new obligational authority in the amount of $193 million for these appropriations for fiscal year 1961. This total consists of previously authorized line items and line items in the process of authorization. In accord with requests of this committee, the amounts of the funding lists equal approximately the requests for new obligational authority.

We are requesting, for the appropriation "Military construction, Navy," new obligational authority in the amount of $190 million. These funds are required to construct and improve facilities urgently needed for the support of the Shore Establishment, the sole purpose of which is to support and serve the operating forces of the Navy. The projects contained in this program have been carefully screened, reviewed, and exhaustingly analyzed within the Navy and by higher authority, and they represent only the most urgent requirements. The dollar total of our request has been carefully estimated and balanced out against the requirement for "Military personnel," "Operation and maintenance," "Procurement," and "Research, development, test and evaluation," which comprise the total Navy program for fiscal year 1961. The program we are submitting will require the complete utilization of the funds we are requesting. As of this time, there remains to be apportioned in the 1960 program approximately $4 million which will be released in the near future for approved construction items.

For fiscal year 1961 we propose a total availability of funds for this appropriation of $283.8 million to be made up of the $190 million NOA request, $88.8 million brought forward from fiscal year 1960 in an unobligated but fully apportioned status, and $5 million in reimbursements.

Under our obligation plan for fiscal year 1961, we expect to obligate $190.5 million leaving an unobligated balance to carry forward into fiscal year 1962 of $88.3 million. Fiscal year 1961 expenditures are estimated at $238 million.

For comparison, in fiscal year 1960 we had a total availability of $318.8 million (as against $283.8) with an obligation plan of $225 million (as against $190.5) and expenditures of $292 million (as against $238). So in all phases, fiscal year 1961 is reduced in comparison with 1960.

The appropriation "Military construction, Navy (special foreign currency program)" is a new appropriation for which we are request-

ing new obligational authority in the amount of $3 million. These funds are required to construct housing at two isolated locations overseas. This direct appropriation will provide for reimbursement to the Commodity Credit Corporation for foreign currencies at the time they are purchased. Under the practice, to date, reimbursement has been made from quarters allowances withheld from the occupants of the housing.

Under our obligation plan for fiscal year 1961, we will obligate the full $3 million, and of that amount, expenditures are estimated at $1 million.

MAINTENANCE FUNDS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Secretary, for clarification of what you have reflected in your statement starting at page 7, am I to interpret from what is expressed here in your statement that you feel this will have a tendency to bring about a controlled segregation of the expenditure of the O. & M. funds in the necessary maintenance of buildings as against the policy of taking that type of money and putting it in the operational end? Will this clean it up to a degree or not?

Mr. MILNE. I do not think this particular thing will clean it up. I think a couple of other things I mentioned will help.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is that?

Mr. MILNE. First giving the field clear guidelines as to the type of money they are likely to have in the next 5 years, which tends to force them to look at their existing assets.

Secondly, this planning which is now underway in Norfolk and San Diego, which will be broadened later to other areas, means we are forced to sit down and take stock of our existing assets. Last year we made a complete engineering survey in Argentia of every building on the installation and found we had about 90 buildings which were almost at the end of their usefulness that had a life of from zero to 8 years. Those are being surveyed and in due course will be condemned. There is no point in putting maintenance money in buildings that have no real residual life.

I think from these approaches we will get a firmer grasp of what you are talking about. This is to clarify the difference between minor construction and repair.

Mr. SHEPPARD. As I interpret the clarifications you have delineated on page 7 and the following pages, it would appear there is a more definite clarification in this field of expenditure than heretofore and to a degree—what degree will remain to be seen—it will have a tendency, I should think, to give you better control of the issue, and as you get better control of the issue you will have a better grasp of the aspect I am addressing myself to.

Mr. MILNE. That is right; it will help, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There are, of course, many physical structures that have reached the point of diminishing return and in my book it is stupid to spend more money on them. They were originally constructed for a certain period of time, and my concern has not been involved in the tempos but in the basics, and in a tight money situation it presents a very interesting picture. I have been very hopeful that something could be done to correct these things because I feel each of these accounts should stand on its own feet. If you need so much for operation, let there be enough for operation, and if you need so much

for maintenance, you should have enough to maintain the buildings. We have some differences of opinion on this, but I feel very strongly about that.

Any questions on the Secretary's statement?

Mr. SIKES. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

STATUS OF NAVAL STATION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you have any items in this program which have not been fully approved by all reviewing agencies?

Admiral CHEW. I would like to speak to that.

As you know, the project at Anacostia for the naval station has been disapproved without prejudice by the House Armed Services Committee pending a determination by the National Capital Planning Commission that it is a suitable location. That has now been done. The National Capital Planning Commission has approved the site location. It has been forwarded from the Secretary of Defense, who approved it, to the Bureau of the Budget, and I have a letter now from the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget approving it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think under the circumstances you might insert a copy of that letter in the record.

Admiral CHEW. Here is a copy of the letter.

(The letter follows:)

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., March 29, 1960.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In response to the latter, dated March 10, 1960, in which the Deputy Assistant Secretary (Properties and Installations) noted that the National Capital Planning Commission had approved the siting of the proproposed naval station, Washington, D.C., at the present Anacostia Naval Air Station, and requested clearance to inform the Senate Armed Services Committee of this site approval, you are advised that the Bureau of the Budget would have no objection to that committee being so informed. You are advised, however, that this site approval does not constitute approval of any facilities shown on the site map attached to Mr. Benedict's letter beyond those facilities included in the fiscal year 1961 military construction authorization request.

It is noted that in its letter to you, dated March 14, 1960, the Commission indicates the actions it took on March 3 and states its reasons for rejecting the use of the south end of the Bolling Air Force Base as a site for the proposed naval station as well as its reasons for approving siting at the north end of the Anacostia Naval Air Station. We can find no evidence in this letter that further engineering studies may make it advisable to site all new construction, both Navy and Air Force, at the south end of Bolling as is indicated in Assistant Secretary Bryant's memorandum of March 4 to you on this matter. The paragraph at the bottom of page 2 of the Commission's letter is addressed specifically to this point, and you are advised that the Bureau fully supports the Commission's position on the matter. Accordingly, it is requested that your presentation to the Senate Armed Services Committee specifically identify the siting of the proposed facilities on the 95 acres approved for this purpose at the north end of the Anacostia Naval Air Station.

With regard to the Commission's position on the temporary use, for helicopter operations, of 35 acres adjoining the proposed naval station pending consideration of the Commission's request for the removal of such operations from Anacostia, we would appreciate being advised on what action is being taken to resolve this matter. Similarly, information on the Department's proposals with respect to the future of the Bolling Air Force Base would be helpful, as the Commission indicates, to avoid hurried decisions in connection with the develop-

ment of the land to be vacated by Defense and the consideration of any facilities required for this area which may be proposed for inclusion in the fiscal year 1962 military construction authorization program.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER B. STAATS, *Deputy Director.*

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any other items you wish to refer to in response to my question?

Admiral CHEW. That was the only item, sir.

NATURE OF FISCAL YEAR 1961 PROGRAM

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any items which will not be placed under contract in fiscal year 1961?

Admiral CHEW. May I answer that question, sir.

In our authorization program all of the items are on our funding program except one, which was an item of $509,000, and that specifically would not be placed under contract. That is the only item. It is for a boat storage building at San Diego, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you anticipate that any of these items will not be fully funded in fiscal year 1961?

Admiral CHEW. Mr. Sheppard, at this particular time I think it is important, if the money is appropriated for these particular items in the present program, we by necessity and under the rules of the committee will fund them all. As you know, we are still in debt from our 1959 appropriation. We do have urgent line items right now that were authorized and approved for funding for which we still have no funds.

I can speak at great length and in great detail on that later, but in response to your specific question, all the items in the 1961 funding list will be funded.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I suppose that means if the funds are released by those who have custody of those funds. Is that correct?

Admiral CHEW. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Generally speaking, to what extent is the program based on completed plans and specifications?

Admiral PELTIER. Mr. Chairman, we have preliminary engineering on practically all items except the Anacostia project. We do have a fairly good site survey of this, but it is not a complete one from an engineering standpoint such as we normally have. Most of the program has been through our preliminary engineering studies.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In further development of that question, taking your background of experience, Admiral Peltier, what percentage of differential would you expect due to the percentage of preliminary planning against finalization?

Admiral PELTIER. I am not sure I understand the question.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, we have found heretofore that when we have preliminary estimates there are deviations when the plans are finalized. From your background of experience would you say that percentage of differential might be expressed in terms of a 10- or 20-percent increase or decrease? From your past experience and the amount you have today that are actually not finalized, what percentage of differential would you anticipate?

Admiral PELTIER. In this particular program I think it will be within 5 percent.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will you please insert in the record the real property disposal or inactivation action taken or contemplated by the Navy in fiscal year 1960 and fiscal year 1961. Insert that in the record.

(The following information was submitted for the record:)

BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Disposals pending as of Mar. 31, 1960

State	Station	Acres	Cost	
			Land	Improvements
Alabama	NAAS, Barin Field	121.5	$2,000	$2,900,000
Alaska	Unalaska Island	4,199		
California	Naval Shipyard, San Francisco	5.202	23,000	
	Portion of NAS, Lemoore	[1] 1,440		
	Portion of NAS, Alameda	2.78	72,000	79,000
	Point Loma, Fort Rosencrans, San Diego	[1] 40		
	Linda Vista Mesa landing field (Hourglass Field) OLF to Miramar	209.81	6,000	175,000
	NCBC, Port Hueneme (wharf No. 1)	22.07		
	NRC, Camp Elliott, San Diego	26,722	493,000	
	Portion of Naval Hospital, Corona	115	88,000	7,553,000
	Naval Ammunition and Net Depot, Seal Beach			
District of Columbia	Former U.S. Naval Hospital, 9th and Pennsylvania Ave. SE	.705	7,000	21,000
Florida	Portion of Naval Base, Key West	10,105		
	ALF, Richmond	1,969	61,000	4,934,000
	NAAS, Corry Field, Pensacola	643.52	1,478,000	
	Benjamin Lee Field, NS, Green Cove Springs			
Guam	Ratio station	37.52		
	NS (land near Piti)	20.957		45,000
	Global Communications Station (Finagayan-Barrigada).	1,609.77		
	Harmon AFB	655.42		
Hawaii	NAS, Barbers Point	115		
	Naval Supply Center, Pearl Harbor	106.47	12,000	1,326,000
	Waipio Peninsula, DPWO	185	61,000	
	Oahu Naval Reservation	49	22,000	192,000
	Heeia radio station	24.686	45,000	251,000
	Military road (Salt Lake Blvd.), Pearl Harbor.	31.345	10,000	
	NSC, Pearl Harbor, Moanaloa (Damon storage area).	25.9	39,000	1,285,000
	A-1 Aiea open storage area	25		
	A-2 Aiea waterfront area	2		
	A-3 Aiea water pumping station	2		
	A-4 C. & G. Magnetic Observatory	43	4,000	125,000
	Ewa Junction (parcel 1)	56		
	Ewa Junction (parcel 2)	48		
	Fort Barrette (parcel 1)	23		
	Fort Barrette (parcel 2)	22		
	Halawa housing area (parcel 1)	100		
	Halawa housing area (parcel 2)	25		
	Iroquois Point area (NAD, West Loch)	18		
	Manana housing and storage area (parcel 1)	40		
	Manana housing and storage area (parcel 2)	31		
	Manana housing and storage area (parcel 3)	25		
	Iroquois Point area	610		
	Manana housing and storage area (parcel 4)	15		
	McGrew Point housing	.5		
	Naval housing area III (parcel 1)	15		
	Naval housing area III (parcel 2)	7		
	Pearl City dump	28		
	Pearl City Peninsula A-16	62	158,000	
	A-18 Red Hill area (parcel 1)	74	33,000	102,000
	Red Hill area (parcel 3)	17		
	Waipio Peninsula area (parcel 2)	118		
	Nimitz School	8		
	Halawa water storage	6		

[1] Approximate.

BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY—Continued

Disposals pending as of Mar. 31, 1960—Continued

State	Station	Acres	Cost	
			Land	Improvements
Hawaii	Makalapa Crater	15		
	Aliamanu School site	30		
Kentucky	Former Naval Proving Grounds, Knob Creek.	256.15	$5,000	$566,000
Louisiana	NIRS, New Orleans DOD 137			8,069,000
Maryland	NIRAP, DOD 443, Benjies	78.9	75,000	13,677,000
Massachusetts	Portion E St. Annex Shipyard, South Boston.	16	506,000	98,000
	NS, Fargo Bldg. No. 37, Boston	1.5	260,000	1,890,000
Minnesota	NAS, Minneapolis	14.84	31,000	759,000
	Portion of NAS, Minneapolis	.26		
Mississippi	Portion of Naval CBC, Gulfport	13.59	1,900	
Missouri	NIROP, DOD 206, St. Louis	3.75	100,000	4,112,000
	NAS, St. Louis	49.84	44,000	3,556,000
Nebraska	Portion of NAD, Hastings	194.86		2,473,000
	NAD, Hastings	10,556	568,000	294,000
New Jersey	NIRAP, Wallington	7	16,000	3,051,000
New York	High Energy Fuel Plant, Lewiston			4,896,000
	Naval Hospital, St. Albans			1,943,000
	NIROP, Rochester, building Z	.88	12,000	1,694,000
	N&MCRTC, Fort Schuyler	5		596,000
Ohio	NIRAP, DOD No. 481, North Perry	92.5	101,000	1,620,000
Oklahoma	Naval Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant, Muskogee.	1,274	354,000	35,600,000
Pennsylvania	NAD, Fort Mifflin	449.5	751,000	8,726,000
Rhode Island	Goat Island, Newport	29	181,000	6,014,000
Texas	OLF, Cuddihy	802	100,000	4,235,000
	OLF, Cabaniss Field, Corpus Christi	330.36	[1] 3,600,000	
	NAS, Corpus Christi (Peary Pl. housing)	140.07		[1] 1,095,000
Virginia	NAS, Chincoteague	2,400	468,000	22,979,000
	Cheatham Annex NCTC, York and James City County.	544.96		
Virgin Islands	NCAF, St. Thomas	446	30,000	6,408,000
Washington	OLF, Quillayute	1,202	55,000	5,192,000

[1] Land and improvements.

Disposals—January 1, 1960, through March 31, 1960

[Explanation of symbols: B=betterments; L=land; RPP=related personal property]

State	Station	Acres and improvements	Total cost	Cost of land and improvements		Date of disposals	Holding agency No.
				Symbol	Amount		
Alabama	NIRP, DOD No. 2, Chickasaw	33 buildings	$3,984,362	B	$2,850,457	Feb. 19, 1960	Y. & D. 50.
				RPP	1,133,904		
Arizona	NAF, Litchfield Park	3.02 acres	[1] 1,377	B	None	Mar. 25, 1960	11–17.
				L	[1] 1,377		
Arkansas	NAD, Shumaker-Camden	64,149 acres and 1,234 buildings	120,692,224	B	116,400,591	Feb. 26, 1960	51.
				L	1,781,861		
California	NAS, Oakland	6 structures (on leased land)	991,679	RPP	2,509,772		
	Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado	25 quonset buildings	58,973	B	991,679	Nov. 25, 1959	12–11.
	Naval Retraining Command, Camp Elliott.	10 quonset huts	31,518	B	58,973	Jan. 8, 1960	11–15.
	NCAAS, Mojave	2,977.45 acres and 214 buildings	9,400,164	B	31,518	Jan. 20, 1960	11–16.
				L	9,303,542	Jan. 15, 1960	11–12.
Florida	Former NS, Green Cove Springs	2 Homoja buildings	12,000	RPP	96,347		
Guam	Portion of Naval Communication Station, Barrigada.	15.5 acres	5,893	B	275		
Idaho	Naval Ordnance Plant, Pocatello	153.71 acres and 97 various buildings.	18,997,252	L	12,000	Jan. 22, 1960	6–15.
				B	5,893	Sept. 9, 1959	Y. & D. 37.
Louisiana	Naval Station, New Orleans	9 buildings	333,357	L	16,910,420	Mar. 24, 1960	13–16.
Michigan	NIROP, Centerline	6.64 acres and 7 officers' quarters.		RPP	295,317		
Nevada	NIROP, DOD No. 473 and National Ind. Reserve Plant No. 217, Henderson.	290.33 acres and 16 buildings	4,756,400	B	1,791,515	Jan. 11, 1960	8–49–60 (La.).
New Jersey	NIRS, Port Newark	191.6 acres and 69 buildings	18,073,572	L	333,357	Jan. 12, 1960	Transferred to Army.
New York	NIRAP, DOD No. 247, Buffalo	0.75 acre and 1 building	785,385	B			
Oregon	NAS, Niagara Falls	21.88 acres	8,473	L	3,085,602	Feb. 8, 1960	Y. & D. 48.
Texas	Naval Station, Tongue Point	6 miscellaneous buildings	187,361	RPP	2,903		
	Naval Hospital, Corpus Christi	3 buildings	191,515	B	1,667,895	Mar. 18, 1960	Unnumbered.
	NAAS, Chase Field, Beeville	86 house trailers		L	13,420,445		
				RPP	2,435,000		
				B	2,218,127	Feb. 8, 1960	Y. & D. 49.
				L	486,737		
				RPP	291,850		
				B	6,797	Dec. 9, 1959	Transferred to Army.
				B	8,473	Mar. 14, 1960	13–17.
				B	187,361	Jan. 12, 1960	8–58–60 (Tex.).
				B	191,515	Mar. 11, 1960	8–56–60 (Tex.).

			619,598	B	619,598	Feb. 25, 1960	188.
			839,866	B	839,866	Jan. 27, 1960	1452–640.

Virginia	NAS, Chincoteague	72 miscellaneous structures	619,598	B	619,598	Feb. 25, 1960	188.
	Former NAAS, OLF Creeds	352.25 acres and 19 buildings	872,832	B	839,866	Jan. 27, 1960	1452-640.
				L	32,966		
	Former Naval Schools Mine Warfare, Yorktown.	154 acres and buildings, structures, and utilities.	4,311,300			Nov. 25, 1959	Transferred to Coast Guard.
Washington	NIRS, Seattle, Plant "B"	24.3 acres and 28 buildings	1,766,406	B	1,399,133	Jan. 15, 1960	13-13.
				L	115,000		
				RPP	252,273		
	Former NSD, Spokane	0.81 acre				Nov. 19, 1959	Transferred to Army.
West Virginia	NOP, South Charleston	Crane runway structure No. 311.	[1] 32,000	B	32,000	Mar. 15, 1960	165.
New York [2]	Military Medical Supply Agency, Brooklyn.	0.487 acre and 1 building	1,573,479	B	1,492,493	Jan. 29, 1960	3-1, pending.
				L	77,710		
				RPP	3,276		
Oklahoma [3]	Naval Air Technical Training Center, Norman.	1,142.99 acres and 220 buildings	11,482,521	B	11,328,566	Dec. 28, 1959	8-12-59 (Okla.).
				L	153,955		

[1] Estimated.
[2] Correction to Dec. 31, 1959, report.
[3] Addition to Dec. 31, 1959, report.

Area: Acres	69,484.23
Cost:	
Land	$5,216,235
Betterments	179,984,326
Related personal property	9,583,834
Cost not broken down	4,311,300
Total cost	199,095,695

Disposals, fiscal year 1960, July 1, 1959, through Dec. 31, 1959

[Explanation of symbols: B=betterments; L=land; RPP=related personal property]

State	Station	Acres and improvements	Total cost	Cost of land and improvements		Date of disposals	Holding agency No.
				Symbol	Amount		
California	Trust property, Riverside County	80 acres	None			July 17, 1959	Y. & D. 32; pending.
	Portion of naval facility, San Bruno	55.059 acres and 77 buildings	$4,675,458	B	$4,372,458	Aug. 3, 1959	Y. & D. 33; pending.
				L	303,000		
	NIRS DOD No. 17, Alameda	23.9 acres, fee; 27.9 acres, leased; and 57 buildings.	5,074,353	B	3,800,913	Sept. 9, 1959	Y. & D. 34; pending, 3.7 acres to be withdrawn for N & MCRTC.
				L	197,623		
				RPP	1,075,817		
	NIRAP DOD No. 450, Torrance, 190th St. drainage ditch.	10.459 acres	(1)				Quitclaim deed to city of Los Angeles, May 8, 1959.
	Portion of Torrance Annex of Long Beach Naval Shipyard.	26.06 acres and 2 buildings	106,152	B	63,264	Nov. 17, 1959	11-14; pending.
				L	42,888		
	Small boat harbor, MCB Camp Pendleton, Oceanside.	67.23 acres	2,245	B	None	Aug. 14, 1959	35; pending.
				L	2,245		
	Capehart housing project, Chesterton, NS, San Diego.	0.9 acre	1,434			Sept. 18, 1959	Pending.
	Kwajalein Village defense housing project, (CAL-4025-N) (portion of 3.8 acres).	0.69 acre	[2] 1,145			July 23, 1959	12-6; pending.
	Naval hospital (San Leandro Annex), Oakland (portion of 342.46 acres).	137.24 acres and 86 buildings	3,228,456	B	3,200,180	Oct. 16, 1959	12-8; pending.
				L	28,276		
	NIR repair facility, DOD No. 40, Oakland.	2.851 acres (3 buildings on leased land).	491,425	B	472,565	Oct. 30, 1959	Y. & D. 42; pending.
				L	None		
				RPP	18,860		
	Fort Cronkite, San Francisco, harbor defense (Portion of 192 acres).	161.56 acres	14,168	B	None	July 16, 1959	Pending.
				L	14,168		
	Former OLF, Santa Rosa (portion)	31.4 acres				Aug. 14, 1959	Transferred to Army.
	Islais Creek area, MGS, Forwarding Annex, San Francisco.	77.41 acres and 30 buildings	3,524,948	B	2,086,981	Dec. 3, 1959	12-12; pending.
				L	1,433,417		
				RPP	4,550		
Colorado	NAS Buckley Field, Denver	3,588 acres				Dec. 9, 1959	Transferred to AF (effective May 13, 1959).
Connecticut	Departmental Reserve Plant, DCD No. 59, Groton.	21 buildings on leased land	5,450,552	B	5,450,552	Nov. 24, 1959	Y. & D. 43; pending.
Delaware	NIRS, DOD No. 63, Wilmington	121.72 acres and 59 buildings	9,353,860	B	8,115,786	July 2, 1959	Y. & D. 31; pending.
				L	82,539		
				RPP	1,155,535		

Florida	OLF Bronson, NAS Pensacola	3 buildings	355,041	D	355,041	July 6, 1959	6-7; pending.
	Portion of former NAS Vero Beach	4.61 acres and 1 building	9,505	B	9,200	July 2, 1959	6-6; pending.
				L	305		
	OLF Bagdad	614 acres and 2 buildings	350,673	B	347,135	July 28, 1959	Y. & D. 5; pending.
				L	3,537		
	NAS Cecil Field	1 building	60,620	B	60,620	Dec. 29, 1959	6-14; pending.
	do	2 buildings	187,042	B	187,042	July 21, 1959	6-9; assigned to HEW Aug. 4, 1959 for educational purposes.
	NAS Jacksonville	11 buildings	616,546	B	616,546	Oct. 26, 1959	6-13; pending.
	OLF Pace	640 acres and 20,000 linear feet of security fencing.	31,600	B	25,600	Oct. 22, 1959	6-12; pending.
				L	6,000		
	OIF Osceola, NAS Sanford	1,302.11 acres	1,481,376	B	1,474,467	Sept. 21, 1959	38; pending.
				L	6,909		
Idaho	Portion of NOP Pocatello	15.67 acres and 2 buildings	1,910,862	B	1,791,370	Oct. 15, 1959	13-12; pending.
				L	7,200		
				RPP	112,292		
Illinois	NAS Glenview	2 buildings	125,247			Dec. 31, 1959	9-17; pending.
Indiana	NAD Crane	8 buildings	32,358			July 1, 1959	9-7; pending.
Iowa	NAS Ottumwa	29.12 acres and 63 buildings				Oct. 6, 1959	Transferred to Air Force.
Maine	MCRTC Portland	3.03 acres and 6 buildings	102,310	B	82,810	Sept. 3, 1959	1-3; pending.
				L	19,500		
	Ram Island, Kittery	3 acres	[1] 210			Sept. 29, 1959	Pending.
Maryland	Former Piney Point Annex, NGF	0.42 acre				Sept. 17, 1959	Transferred to Coast Guard.
Massachusetts	NIRS DOD No. 162, Hingham	237.16 acres and 72 buildings	18,397,045	B	15,134,148	Sept. 23, 1959	40; pending.
				L	221,445		
				RPP	3,041,452		
	Fire Fighting School, K Street Annex, Boston.	3.84 acres and 9 buildings	380,235	B	358,557	Dec. 16, 1959	1-3; pending.
				L	21,678		
Missouri	N & MCRTC St. Louis	9.8 acres and 3 buildings	527,143	B	437,143	Oct. 7, 1959	9-14; pending.
				L	90,000		
Nebraska	NAD Hastings, portion of 48,752.77 acres	10,556.2 acres and 4 buildings	862,995	B	294,566	July 13, 1959	9-12; pending (Preliminary).
				L	568,429		
New Jersey	NIRAP Teterboro	8.70 acres and 2 buildings	1,368,100	B	1,349,600	Dec. 16, 1959	Y. & D. 46; pending.
				L	[1] 18,500		
	NIRS, Kearney, DOD No. 230	168.59 acres and 131 buildings	26,556,799	B	17,098,629	Dec. 16, 1959	Y. & D. 44; pending.
				L	2,375,000		
				RPP	7,083,170		
New York	NIRAP, DOD 270, Syosset	1.6 acres	37,000	L	37,000	July 2, 1959	30; sold to E.P.R. Realty Co., Inc., by GSA Dec. 4, 1959 for $37,515.
	NIROP, DOD 250, Dresden	31.01 acres and 18 buildings	2,899,474	B	2,105,609	Sept. 4, 1959	36; pending.
				L	9,761		
				RPP	784,104		
	NIROP, DOD 262, Poughkeepsie	10 acres and 9 buildings	4,157,119	B	1,215,865	Oct. 29, 1959	41; pending.
				L	18,353		
				RPP	2,922,901		

See footnotes at end of table.

Disposals, fiscal year 1960, July 1, 1959, through Dec. 31, 1959—Continued

[Explanation of symbols: B=betterments; L=land; RPP=related personal property]

State	Station	Acres and improvements	Total cost	Cost of land and improvements		Date of disposals	Holding agency No.
				Symbol	Amount		
New York	NIRAP, DOD 238, Bronx	0.56 acre				Oct. 31, 1959	Transferred to Army.
	Military Medical Supply Agency, Brooklyn.	0.487 acre	$73,945	B L	None $73,945	Dec. 4, 1959	Pending.
	Naval Supply Depot, Scotia	338.69 and 99 buildings	19,653,013	B L	19,373,523 279,490	Dec. 4, 1959	Pending.
North Carolina	MC OLF, Edenton	3,259.27 acres and 123 buildings	13,450,488	B L	13,064,113 386,375	Sept. 28, 1959	146; pending.
	Former NRTC, Raleigh	3 buildings (on leased land)	132,201	B	132,201	July 7, 1959	6-8; facilities being transferred to lessor.
Ohio	NIROP, Canton	120 acres and 31 buildings	19,109,416	B L RPP	8,883,824 55,500 10,170,092		
Oklahoma	Naval Reserve training facility, Norman	Building No. 916 and underlying and adjacent land, 1.06 acres.	2,672			Dec. 18, 1959	Quitclaimed by Navy Nov. 25, 1959 to Oklahoma University for and in consideration of the assumption by the university of costs of relocating Navy-owned radio transmitter equipment to building No. 502.
Oregon	Walluski housing area, Astoria	3.95 acres and 13 buildings	132,601	B L	132,600 1	Nov. 13, 1959	13-6; pending.
Pennsylvania	N & MCRTC, Reading (municipal airport).	22.76 acres and 22 buildings	470,155	B L	463,555 6,600	Aug. 24, 1959	4-5; pending.
	NIRS DOD 370, Philadelphia	45.47 acres, fee; 1.4 acres, leased; 91 buildings.	22,957,549	B L R.P.P	15,474,431 2,488,161 4,994,957	Nov. 12, 1959	Y. & D 45; pending.
	N & MCRTC, Eddystone (industrial highway).	2 14 acres and 7 buildings	378,965	B L	378,965 None	Aug. 21, 1959	4-7; pending.
	Naval Aviation Supply Depot, Philadelphia.	0.51 acre	2,285	B	2,285	Sept. 1, 1959	4-8; pending.
	Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia (Lippincott Bldg.).	0.57 acre	494,204	B L	464,204 30,000	Dec. 18, 1959	4-11; pending.
Texas	Naval Training and Distribution Center, Camp Wallace, Hitchock.	1,603.2 acres	885,141	B L	800,868 84,273	Sept. 28, 1959	39; pending.
	Naval Security Station, LaPorte	282 acres	28,200	L	28,200	Nov. 4, 1959	8-21-59(Tex); pending.
	NAS, Corpus Christi	2 buildings	66,960	B	66,960	Aug. 24, 1959	Pending.

Virginia	Diesel School, Richmond (portion of 103.005 acres).	77.6 acres and 14 buildings	1,865,507	B	1,745,204	Sep. 1, 1959	7308–700; pending.
				L	120,303		
	Cheapside tower site, Little Creek	0.98 acre and structure (tower)	15,600	B	14,900	Aug. 12, 1959	Pending.
				L	700		
	Navy landing site, Norfolk	1.5 acres and 4 buildings	177,000	B	131,000	Aug. 12, 1959	5118–50; pending.
				L	46,000		
Washington	Housing project, Hadlock	6 acres and 7 buildings	89,542	B	89,242	Sept. 15, 1959	13–10; pending.
				L	300		
	NAS, Seattle	13 miscellaneous buildings	19,670	B	19,670	Sept. 4, 1959	13–8; pending.
	Portion of Shearwater housing project, NAS, Seattle.	1.84 acres and 2 buildings	6,804	B	4,500	July 21, 1959	13–7; pending.
				L	2,304		

[1] Without commercial value.
[2] Estimated.

Area: Acres	23,787.77
Costs:	
Land	$9,114,999
Betterments	131,887,014
Related personal property	31,363,730
Total cost	172,365,743

Disposals, fiscal year 1959

[Explanation of symbols: B=betterments; L=land; RPP=related personal property]

State	Station	Acres and improvements	Total cost	Cost of land and improvements		Date of disposals	Holding agency No.
				Symbol	Amount		
Alabama	Title VIII—Housing, Foley, NAAS, Barin Field.	11.57 acres and 19 buildings	$393,837	B L	$352,837 41,000	June 29, 1959	6-5; pending.
	OLF Wolf No. 27016	48.53 acres	684	L	684	Feb. 24, 1959	6-3; quitclaimed, July 17, 1959, to private individuals for $3,626.53.
Arkansas	NAD, Shumaker	4,094.33 acres and 9 buildings	951,371	B L	855,421 95,950	Aug. 5, 1958	595; pending.
	Walcott Auxiliary Field	613.06 acres	208,835	B L	149,690 59,145	Nov. 14, 1958	616; assigned to HEW, Aug. 11, 1959.
	Erwin Auxiliary Field	513.11 acres	854,410	B L	790,506 63,904	do	615; assigned to HEW, Aug. 12, 1959.
California	MCAAS Mojave (portion)	11.56 acres	13,173	B L	13,000 173	July 17, 1958	587; transferred to HEW, Apr. 29, 1959.
	Lexington housing development, Long Beach.	4.5 acres	Nil			Oct. 16, 1958	Transferred to Army.
	NIRP, San Francisco, DOD 47	0.5 acre and 1 building	545,409	B L RPP	247,180 18,423 30,755	July 28, 1958	590; pending.
	NAS, Alameda	1 building	63,100	B	63,100	Aug. 11, 1958	596; pending.
	MCSC, Daggett Annex, Barstow	1,082 acres and 82 buildings	5,489,542	B L RPP	5,448,794 9,993 30,755	Sept. 15, 1958	598; pending.
	Naval Advance Base Personnel Depot, San Bruno.	1 building	195,471	B	195,471	Sept. 18, 1958	600; pending.
	MCB Camp Pendleton, Sterling Homes project, No. 4994N.	0.737 acre	None			Aug. 27, 1958	Quitclaimed to Oceanside School District through HEW.
	MCB, Twentynine Palms	Telephone cable with terminals, 2,500 lineal feet (approximate).	3,690	B	3,690	Oct. 30, 1958	613; pending.
	NIRS, San Pedro, DOD 33	9.529 acres, fee; 49.249 acres, leased.	3,999,940	B L RPP	3,559,415 21,500 419,025	Nov. 21, 1958	Y. & D. 1; pending.
	Naval Disciplinary Barracks, San Pedro	27.89 acres	2,682,215	B L	2,682,215 (1)	Jan. 9, 1959	10; pending; Department of Justice has a firm requirement for property.
Connecticut	Norden Division, United Aircraft, plant 2, Milford.	1 building (on leased land)	427,749	B RPP	12,129 415,620	June 17, 1959	Y. & D. 26; pending.

Florida	Portion of NIRS, Tampa	1.6 acres	54,000	B	48,000	Jan. 2, 1959	Sold Aug. 13, 1959, to Ware Manufacturing Co. for $42,000.
				L	6,000		
	NIRS, Panama City, DOD 67	118.03 acres and 56 buildings	4,646,908	B	3,719,608	June 23, 1959	28; pending.
				L	17,287		
				RPP	910,013		
	Former naval commissary store, (portion) NB, Key West.	0.84 acre	105,380	B	93,380	July 18, 1958	586; quitclaimed to Board of Public Instruction, Monroe County, for educational purposes.
				L	12,000		
	Title VIII housing area, Dredgers' Key, Key West.	8.88 acres	(2)			Oct. 1, 1958	592; quitclaimed to Board of Public Instruction, Monroe County, for educational purposes.
	OLF, Lyons	207.75 acres	8,541	B	3,600	Sept. 26, 1958	604; sold to private individual for $45,000 July 7, 1959.
				L	4,941		
	OLF, Helm	320 acres	15,315	B	3,600	Sept. 26, 1958	607; pending; 280 acres quitclaimed to Price Florida Acres, Inc., et al., June and July 1959 for $69,500.
				L	11,715		
	OLF, Forman	540.21 acres	534,214	B	520,508	Oct. 17, 1958	610; pending.
				L	13,706		
	Former MCAS-MC "Gator" homing facility, Miami.	1 building (on leased land)	48,261	B	38,400	Dec. 17, 1958	Y. & D. 6; pending—lease expired June 30, 1959—for transfer to and operation by Civil Aeronautics Administration.
				L			
				RPP	9,861		
	Portion of former NAS, Fort Lauderdale	0.5 acre and 1 building	3,430	B	3,400	Dec. 5, 1958	Y. &. D. 2; quitclaim deed to Broward County, Mar. 25, 1959.
				L	30		
	Spencer bomb target	372.7 acres and 1 building	16,225	B	13,105	Feb. 13, 1959	6–2; sold to various individuals July and September 1959 for $82,950.
				L	3,120		
	Former MCAS, Miami	4,254.61 acres and 484 buildings	23,093,887	B	21,602,795	June 22, 1959	Y. & D. 27; pending.
				L	1,430,159		
				RPP	60,933		
	do	6.82 acres				do	Transferred to Army.
Georgia	NOP, Macon	5.39 acres				Oct. 20, 1958	Quitclaim deed to city of Macon for $4,250.
	Radio transmitter station site near NAS, Atlanta.	8.52 acres	1,650	L	1,650	Feb. 4, 1959	6–1; quitclaimed to county June 30, 1959.
	NAS, Atlanta	71.18 acres and 78 buildings	5,855,638	B	5,769,001	May 14, 1959	Y. &. D. 20; pending.
				L	44,861		
				RPP	41,776		
Hawaii	NSC, Ewa	175 acres				June 17, 1959	Transferred to Commerce.
Idaho	Portion of NOP, Pocatello	42.36 acres	18,900	L	18,900	June 18, 1959	Y. & D. 25; pending.
	David W. Taylor Model Basin Field Station, Bayview.	22.95 acres	1,347	B	261	Sept. 18, 1958	601; sold to private individuals for $16,210.12 July 10, 1959.
			4,000	L	1,086		
Illinois	NIRS, Seneca, DOD 100	195.725 acres and 43 buildings	4,959,363	B	4,612,519	Nov. 21, 1958	572; pending.
				L			
				RPP	342,844		

See footnotes at end of table.

Disposals, fiscal year 1959—Continued

[Explanation of symbols: B=betterments; L=land; RPP=related personal property]

State	Station	Acres and improvements	Total cost	Cost of land and improvements		Date of disposals	Holding agency No.
				Symbol	Amount		
Indiana	NAD, Crane	2 buildings	$2,200			Sept. 5, 1958	Pending.
		43 buildings	214,219			Sept. 10, 1958	Do.
		38 buildings	89,369			Nov. 14, 1958	Do.
Kansas	Wirt Auxiliary Landing Field to NAS, Hutchinson.	506.19 acres and 4 buildings	1,731,923	B L	$1,639,915 92,008	Jan. 14, 1959	Y. & D. 8; pending transfer without compensation to city of Newton. Aug. 27, 1959.
	NAS, Hutchinson	2,565.1 acres	378,115			May 13, 1959	Transferred to Air Force.
Louisiana	Portion of Planters bypass canal, NAD (portion of 40.18 acres).	6.16 acres				July 28, 1958	Transferred to Army.
	NAS, Houma	1.01 acres and 1 building	5,054	B L	4,912 140	Oct. 16, 1958	Transferred to Air Force.
		Horton sphere				Mar. 17, 1959	Transferred to National Aeronautics and Space Administration without reimbursement.
Maine	Fort Foster Military Reservation, Kittery	92.72 acres and 9 buildings	664,372	B L	616,000 48,372	Jan. 12, 1959	Y. & D. 3; pending.
	Naval security group activity, Winter Harbor.	1.89 acres	1,623	L	1,623	June 23, 1959	1-1 1ND; pending.
	Bass Harbor head transmitting station	Radio facilities building electric power cable, and electric transmission line.	11,102			Oct. 23, 1958	Transferred to Coast Guard.
Maryland	Piney Point Annex of the U.S. Weapons Plant.	94.89 acres and 41 buildings	1,903,627	B L RPP	1,775,753 23,338 104,536	July 3, 1958	584; pending.
	Docking facility, Fishing Creek Harbor, Chesapeake Beach.	Dock and 4 frame buildings	17,595	B	17,595	Dec. 16, 1958	21-1; pending.
	Solomons Annex, NAS, Patuxent River	54 quonset huts	329,918	B RPP	312,768 17,150	Jan. 22, 1959	21-2; pending.
	Family housing area, Piney Point Annex	16.5 acres and 65 buildings	291,951	B L RPP	278,416 13,000 535	June 30, 1959	29; pending.
Massachusetts	Government improvements on Fore River Railroad Corp. owned land.	Railroad trackage, chain link fence, flood lighting equipment, 2 crane runway foundations, and 2 buildings and 3 steel tanks.	87,115			Aug. 1, 1958	593; pending.
	Portion of the Marblehead Electronics Research Annex, Marblehead Neck.	1.59 acres	14,899	B L	2,149 12,750	Sept. 29, 1958	605; sold June 29, 1959, for $35,877 to private individuals.

	Mishaum Point Military Reservation, Dartmouth.	26.84 acres	45,000			July 29, 1958	Transferred to Air Force.
	Portion of Fort Heath Military Reservation, Winthrop.	17.09 acres	(3)			Aug. 20, 1958	Transferred to Army.
Michigan	NIRAP, Romulus DOD 471	158.33 acres	15,186,483	B L	15,083,214 103,269	July 29, 1958	591; quitclaimed Sept. 30, 1959, to Kelsey-Hayes Co., $2,260,000.
Mississippi	CBC, Gulfport	182 quonset huts	199,432	B	199,432	Dec. 3, 1958	177 quonset huts assigned to HEW for offsite use Jan. 30, 1959; 5 quonset huts transferred to Agriculture Apr. 24, 1959.
Missouri	MCRTC, St. Joseph	0.4 acre and 1 building	72,250	B L	70,000 2,250	Feb. 13, 1959	Y. & D. 16; sold Nov. 4, 1959 for $28,500 to private individual.
Nebraska	NAD, Hastings	27 buildings	60,507	B	60,507	Feb. 3, 1959	9-1; pending.
	NAS, Lincoln	96.82 acres	26,650	L	26,650	Apr. 27, 1959	Transferred to Air Force.
Nevada	NAD, Hawthorne	1,390 acres	(2)			Jan. 28, 1959	Transferred to Interior for return to public domain.
New Hampshire	Naval Retraining Command, Portsmouth.	2.29 acres	5,750	L	5,750	June 23, 1959	1-2 ND 1; pending.
New Jersey	Portion of the NIROP, Newark, DOD 232.	4 0.66 acre				Aug. 20, 1958	Transferred to Army.
New York	Government-owned improvements located at Bethlehem Steel Co., Staten Island.	Welding platens and 2 buildings.	26,979			July 28, 1958	589; pending.
	Portion of N & MCRTC, Fort Schuyler, Bronx.	11.25 acres and 7 buildings	596,040	B L	593,800 2,240	Oct. 23, 1958	612; pending.
	NIR, repair pier 44, Brooklyn	10.5 acres and 9 buildings	1,315,631	B L RPP	611,499 689,868 14,264	do	611; sold to Port of New York Authority Aug. 31, 1959 for, $1,250,100.
	Maspech Annex to the New York NS	108.651 acres and 109 buildings	5 9,470,399	B RPP	8,782,049 688,350	Nov. 14, 1958	608; sold to Empire State Bldg. Corp. June 5, 1959 for $6,016,000.
	Naval Radio Station, Amagansett, Long Island.	41.457 acres	35,363	L	35,363	Aug. 18, 1958	Transferred to Coast Guard.
North Carolina	Former NAAS, Edenton	22.47 acres	1,856	L	1,856	Apr. 3, 1959	1459-295; quitclaimed to town of Edenton Aug. 6, 1959.
	Enfield housing project, Elizabeth City (portion of 32.11 acres).	2.32 acres				Aug. 21, 1958	Transferred to Army.
	MCAS, Cherry Point	4.26 acres				Aug. 25, 1958	Transferred to Air Force for right to use for construction and installation of cable lines.
Ohio	NIR, metal fabricating and machining plant, DOD 322, Warren.	19.13 acres and 23 buildings	4,028,892	B L RPP	2,192,698 306,000 1,530,194	Aug. 7, 1958	594; sold to Bridgeport Brass Co. Aug. 27, 1959 for $1,300,000.
	NAS, Columbus	28 buildings	1,323,723			June 24, 1959	Y. & D. 4-3; pending.
Oklahoma	Former naval hospital, Norman	119.59 acres and 54 buildings	2,818,617	B L	2,803,370 15,247	Sept. 5, 1958	458; land and 39 buildings sold Aug. 3, 1959 for $127,363; mineral rights, buildings, easements to various individuals, et al. $97,086.
	NAD, McAlester	6 buildings	80,401			Jan. 15, 1959	8-4-Okla; pending; 3 buildings sold to counties Apr. 24, 1959, for $215.

See footnotes at end of table.

Disposals, fiscal year 1959—Continued

[Explanation of symbols: B=betterments; L=land; RPP=related personal property]

State	Station	Acres and improvements	Total cost	Cost of land and improvements		Date of disposals	Holding agency No.
				Symbol	Amount		
Pennsylvania	NIRS, Ambridge, DOD 329	63.85 acres and 29 buildings	$6,195,224	B	$5,159,549	Aug. 19, 1958	597; sold Sept. 21, 1959 for $675,000 to private individual.
				L	64,641		
				RPP	971,034		
	NIROP, Homestead, DOD 369	2 buildings	847,619	B	404,218	Sept. 22, 1958	602; sold to United States Steel Corp. Feb. 25, 1959, for $220,000.
				RPP	443,401		
	Naval Metal Laboratory, Munhall	0.394 acres and 1 building	164,943	B	72,500	Sept. 30, 1958	603; pending.
				L	7,500		
				RPP	84,943		
	Portion of title VIII housing site, NAS, Willow Grove.	7 acres				Apr. 20, 1959	Transferred to Army.
	Portion of title VIII housing site, NAS, Willow Grove.	12.2 acres	14,306	L	14,306	July 18, 1958	585; pending.
South Carolina	NIR Shipyard, Charleston	19.036 acres	3,597,559	B	2,087,083	June 17, 1959	Y. & D. 23; pending.
				L	529,000		
				RPP	981,476		
	Naval Minecraft Base, Charleston	10.25 acres, fee; 11 acres, lease	2,465,423	B	2,465,422	Apr. 6, 1959	Y. & D. 19; pending.
				L	1		
Rhode Island	Electric power transmission line easement, NB, Newport.	36.62 acres	39,646	L	39,646	Aug. 11, 1958	588; pending.
Texas	NAAS, Kingsville	2 buildings	259,400	B	259,400	Sept. 9, 1958	599; pending.
	NAAS, Rodd Field, Corpus Christi	890.9 acres and 77 buildings	4,526,357	B	4,428,442	Nov. 13, 1958	614; pending.
				L	97,915		
	NAAS, Kingsville	20 miscellaneous buildings and structures.	19,717	B	19,717	Jan. 15, 1959	8-7-59-Tex; pending.
	Portion of NAF, Hitchcock	0.84 acre	[1] 18			Dec. 24, 1958	Transferred to Commerce (Weather Bureau).
Virgin Islands	Naval degaussing station on Hassel Island, St. Thomas.	4.64 acres					Quitclaimed to private individual June 4, 1959, for $79,000.
	Former MCAF, St. Thomas	50.9 acres				June 30, 1959	Transferred to Army.
Virginia	Departmental reserve plant, Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., DOD 406.	58.86 acres and 48 buildings	20,882,052	B	14,421,245	Nov. 4, 1958	Pending.
				L	1		
				R.P.P	6,460,805		
	MCS, Quantico	0.1 acre and 1 building	14,116	B	11,760	June 17, 1959	22; pending.
				L	100		
				R.P.P	2,256		

Washington	NAS, Ault Field, Oak Harbor	20 buildings	57,875	B	57,875	Aug. 4, 1958	583; pending.
	NIR Shipyard, Tacoma	1 building (chapel)	27,366			May 29, 1959	Transferred to Air Force.
	Former NSD, Spokane	549.85 acres and 81 buildings	13,907,135	B	13,834,982		580; pending; 15.86 acres and 2 buildings transferred to GSA Aug 7, 1959; 0.81 acre withdrawn for transfer to Army Oct. 27, 1959.
				L	72,153	Sept. 30, 1958	
	Part of NIRS, Tacoma, DOD 442	182.71 acres and 113 buildings	15,386,762	B	10,596,229	Oct. 1, 1958	606; pending. 3.5 account to BUPERS June 26, 1958.
				L	1,938,064		
				RPP	2,852,468		
	Puget Sound NS, Shelton Annex	407.72 acres and 1 building	150,449	B	147,364	Jan. 22, 1959	Y. & D. 9; Pending.
				L	3,085		
	Magnolia Manor naval housing project, NSD, Seattle.	Electric distribution system	10,220	B	10,220	Dec. 31, 1958	Y. & D 12; sold to city of Seattle Department of Lighting for $7,100 (Dec. 31, 1958, bill of sale).
	Portion of NSD, Seattle, Tacoma storage branch.	5.64 acres and 4 buildings				Oct. 14, 1958	Transferred to Interior, Geological Survey.
		0.11 acre of right of way and improvements.				Jan. 22, 1959	Transferred to Army.
	NIR, Shipyard, Everett	70.56 acres and 51 buildings	6,366,450	B	4,160,147	May 20, 1959	Y. & D. 21.
				L	453,682		
				RPP	1,752,621		
	NAS, Seattle	9.31 acres and 1 building	731,869	B	703,939	Feb. 9, 1959	Transferred to GSA.
				L	27,930		
	NRTC, Longview	0.905 acre	None			Dec. 10, 1958	Pending
West Virginia	NOP, South Charleston (portion of 207 acres).	3 acres	5,046	L	5,046	Oct. 15, 1958	Do.
	NIROP, Huntington, DOD 427 (portion of 12.6 acres).	9.81 acres and 17 buildings	4,909,888	B	1,705,602	June 17, 1959	Y. & D. 24 pending.
				L	19,655		
				RPP	3,184,631		

[1] Transfer from Justice.
[2] Public domain land.
[3] Transfer from Army in 1948.
[4] Estimated.
[5] Prorated.
[6] Maspeth Annex to New York Naval Shipyard reflects cost of class II and class III property only; land cost is not known.

Acres	* 20,483.69
Land	$6,575,360.00
Betterments	$148,244,418.00
Related personal property	$21,597,041.00
Total cost	$176,416,819.00

*Included in total acreage is 1,398.88 acres of public domain land for which no cost can be quoted.

CONTRACTS AWARDED ON OTHER THAN ADVERTISED COMPETITIVE BASIS IN FISCAL YEAR 1960

Mr. SHEPPARD. What contracts were awarded in fiscal year 1960 on other than an advertised competitive basis, and if any, why?

Admiral PELTIER. We have, Mr. Chairman, the Sheppard report which deals with that. First, there is one at Charleston, S.C., that was negotiated due to the default of the contractor.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What percentage of that contract, if you know, was defaulted, 25 percent, 50 percent, 75 percent?

Admiral PELTIER. I do not have that information here. I can supply it for the record.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you will. You can put the listing in the record that you have there, because it is quite extensive, is it not?

Admiral PELTIER. No. It covers about four pages. There are nine contracts.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Put them in the record and give the answer on each of them as in the first answer, if you will.

Admiral PELTIER. Yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

The negotiated contracts in the military construction program which were not completed as of December 31, 1959, are as follows: Of these contracts, only B–22983 and B–26680 were awarded this fiscal year.

B–13175: Construction of administration building, boathouse, and outside facilities at NMB, Charleston, S.C. Total contract amount: $1,209,903. Reason for negotiation: Uncompleted portion of defaulted contracts NBy 838 and NBy 4928. At the time of default, contracts NBy 838 and NBy 4928 were respectively 41 and 17 percent complete.

B–16584: Construction of enlisted men's barracks at NAS Glynco, Ga. Total contract amount: $678,925. Reason for negotiation: Uncompleted portion of defaulted contract NBy 4950. At time of default contract NBy 4950 was 31 percent complete.

B–17809: Construction of radio telescope and attendant facilities of NRS, Sugar Grove, W. Va. Total contract amount: $58,033,995. Reason for negotiation: Highly technical unique research nature of this classified work would not permit award on a competitive basis.

B–20523: Construction of part of operational building at headquarters, CINCLANT, Norfolk, Va. Total contract amount: $13,200. Reason for negotiation: Necessary to achieve uniform flooring specified by Remington Rand Corp., who was installing computer under contract.

B–24891: Repair and rehabilitate State roads at NRS, Cutler, Maine. Total contract amount: $182,500. Reason for negotiation: Contract placed with State of Maine Highway Department since work involved State roads under State of Maine highway jurisdiction.

B–26680: Replacement of existing boilers and auxilaries at NSB, New London, Conn. Total contract amount: $582,000. Reason for negotiation: Procurement and installation of highly technical equipment, involving close coordination of highly specialized personnel, which it was impractical to obtain by means of formal competitive bidding.

B–13174: Construction of waterfront facilities at NMB, Charleston, S.C. Total contract amount: $2,331,831. Reason for negotiation: Uncompleted portion of defaulted contract NBy 94250. At time of default contract NBy 94250 was 41 percent complete.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you contemplate any further action in this respect in fiscal year 1960 or fiscal year 1961?

Admiral PELTIER. Negotiated contracts? No, sir; not now. There may be some circumstance we cannot foresee now where it may be prudent to do that, but normally we would rather do it by lump sum competitive bid.

No contracts were awarded to other than the low responsive bidder.

CONTRACTOR QUALIFICATIONS

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have situations where a contractor, for some reason, does not qualify under the requirements of the contract?

Admiral PELTIER. Yes, sir, and we are going to have to start working on the qualifications of these low bidders in much more detail than in the past, because we have had difficulty with some contractors that have given the low bid but do not have the qualifications for the job.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It would be my position that due to the size of your present construction program you could move in at this time and start applying that particular philosophy better than you have before.

Admiral PELTIER. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And I want to compliment you on cleaning up some unnecessary problems and headaches that not only your department but others have been participating in. I do not see any reason why these people should not have to qualify. If they do not have the background of experience they should not be permitted to bid.

Admiral PELTIER. We have projects now where the district public works officer can require a prime contractor to perform a percentage of the work as a protective measure.

We have to analyze the job. In some jobs there would be no need to do it, but in other jobs we should.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that working out satisfactorily?

Admiral PELTIER. This has been only the last month. We have not had enough experience to say.

COST-PLUS-FIXED-FEE CONTRACTS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you have any outstanding cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts?

Admiral PELTIER. We had cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts in Spain. All other cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts have been closed out and they are lump-sum jobs, the last being the Spanish bases done about 2 years ago.

Mr. SIKES. May I ask if there will be any cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts in this construction program?

Admiral PELTIER. There is none contemplated. All the work here should be able to be done on a lump-sum competitive bid basis.

AWARD OF ARCHITECT-ENGINEER CONTRACTS

Mr. SHEPPARD. How do you handle the ward of A. & E. contracts? How do you select the architect and engineer? You are refining the requirements in your construction work, which I compliment you for doing. What are you going to do and what is your present policy in the selection of A. & E. contractors?

Admiral PELTIER. Mr. Chairman, the selection of A. & E. work is the beginning of the construction process and it is a very important step. It determines the final product to a considerable extent. At the present time we have found this to be a very satisfactory system. Most of our work is done in the district. Ninety-five percent of our architects and engineers are selected at the district level. The districts determine what jobs they have to do. On that basis they go through

their brochures and pick out from 5 to 10 contractors whom they consider qualified to do the job. Then this list is turned over to a selection board and the board interviews the individual architect-engineer firms. From this interview the board selects the firm which they believe at this particular time is best qualified to do the job from the standpoint of previous experience, present workload, and other factors.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I do not know how many they ask in for a conference of this character, but I presume you ask more than one?

Admiral PELTIER. Yes, sir. Never less than three.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Never less than three. You are the selectors and under the law you have the right to exercise that privilege. What is the system used by those who do this internal surveying for you in order to see that they get the right kind of people and save money by not selecting improperly qualified people to do the work?

Admiral PELTIER. We have had some sorry experiences, I will concede, and we have had some good experiences. The ones that are sorry are the ones you hear about.

We follow this additional process: After a job has been constructed, we make an analysis of this construction, determining how many change orders have been made. Then we advise the A. & E. wherein his plan is deficient, and this becomes a part of his contract record, a part of his folder. Thus, the selection board 2 years later will know how well he performed on the job. It will be a record of just how the last job he designed turned out. It will show the number of change orders required any anything else that went sour, if anything did, and we will have a better evaluation of the A. & E. This should improve our selection of A. & E.'s.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is there anything in the premise of evaluation wherein you use the yardstick of the military itself calling for change orders rather than change orders becoming necessary because of improper design of the A. & E.?

Admiral PELTIER. Yes. Some change orders will not be because of his improper design.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is the distinction I wanted to point out, where there should be more careful preliminary investigations.

Admiral PELTIER. We can sometimes spend more money on investigations than would be warranted, where it would be more prudent to make change orders. We have to pay for actual conditions, regardless of what is shown on the plans. It then becomes a matter of how well we negotiate the change orders.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When you have a complicated disagreement by and between the contractor and the military itself because of not having the original ground investigations properly done, you have a bad end result and you must negotiate that with the contractor and in some instances it goes into litigation.

Admiral PELTIER. We have several instances like that now.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you not think when you get into the litigation aspect that becomes a component part of the cost factor, and would it not be more economical to have a proper investigative job done in the first instance?

Admiral PELTIER. In the particular instance I am thinking of we were wrong in not going deeper into the investigation phase and we have had plenty of headaches. But generally on large structures the

foundation is pretty well confined. It is not like a housing project that is spread over many acres.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I believe you have covered the next question of what steps you take to see that the Government gets a good job at the most economical price. Your response was in the method in which you select these people?

Admiral PELTIER. That is helping the situation some. I do not think you will ever correct it entirely. You do not build structures as complicated as we are building nowadays without some change orders. It would be impossible. You cannot get a firm enough requirement to expect to get a firm price from a contractor.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In my opinion, Admiral, if you people in the Engineering Division, called upon to fabricate the bricks and mortar, were brought into the picture earlier so that you would know what you have to have, a lot of the complication and headaches could be eliminated.

Admiral PELTIER. This is true, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. These conferences have a tendency to be helpful.

Admiral PELTIER. They do. We are encouraging our people to conduct them, particularly on any complicated project. I am sure we have had clarification of plans and specifications at these prebid conferences. This is another effort we are making to improve the administration of construction. It will be a multitude of little things, not just one big thing. It will be a multitude of efforts that will improve the program. We are continually reviewing this problem. In our last district public works officers conference we had in Norfolk last fall we spent practically a whole day on this one item of change orders.

We really went into it in many details. It is something that is receiving very much attention in the Bureau of Yards and Docks today. We hope we can improve it in the next 2 years. It is something that is not going to improve overnight. It will take time. We do think we are going to improve it. Certainly it won't go the other way with all the attention we are giving it, everybody from the top on down. We are bidding a lot of these changes, now, that we used to negotiate. If we cannot agree with a contractor on a price and if it is subject to actual physical separation so we can do the job separately, we are bidding change orders as small as $3,000 in some of these jobs right now.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let me ask you this question: Assuming you have a series of change orders on hypothetical "A" project. Do you let those change orders accumulate into any solid factor, dollarwise, and then put them out to competitive bid or do you take them as a pair and as to the degree that you think they should be rebid?

Admiral PELTIER. On some jobs some things have to be done before others can be done. The timing is important. You have to have the foundation in before you build a superstructure.

Certain things you cannot delay.

You have to make changes. Generally, for changes in the foundations due to unforeseen conditions, separate bidding is not feasible; but what I am thinking of is: after the basic structure is pretty well up, we get into disagreement with the contractor on the price of necessary change and we say we will bid it. Sometimes that brings them around.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I presume you would have pretty much the same idea this year that you had last year when the question was asked, as I

recall it, the so-called competitive bid in the A. & E. work would be prohibitive. It would be almost impossible to apply.

Admiral PELTIER. Yes, sir. I would be very much against bidding A. & E. work.

Mr. JONAS. Would you yield, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Mr. JONAS. Admiral, what policy do you follow in awarding A. & E. contracts or selecting A. & E.'s? Assume that you have half a dozen or two or three under consideration for a job. Do you give any consideration to past experience with those A. & E.'s or do you undertake to spread the work?

Admiral PELTIER. We do both, Mr. Jonas. We certainly give consideration to the past A. & E. performance. Now, if the job is at one location and there are, say, three $500,000 jobs we might give those to one A. & E. because the administrative costs of three people coming in would be greater. If we had them in three separate sites and they were different types of projects, we would probably award contracts to three different A. & E.'s.

We give preference to the local people, people within the State generally, but sometimes that does not always hold. Sometimes there are overriding technical considerations.

Mr. JONAS. In your program last year, how many different A. & E. contracts did you award?

How many different A. & E.'s did you use?

Admiral PELTIER. I would say it was over 200 contracts, covering a net of about 180 line items. Now, there are several places where we have as many as eight line items at one station. We might have that broken down into two A. & E.'s. I am thinking of Lemoore. I think Lemoore has two A. & E.'s who are doing the basic work for 1960. At Meridian I think we have two A. & E.'s. At some stations we might have two line items of separate character requirements and they would be different A. & E.'s. We have used about 75 different A. & E.'s for the fiscal year 1960 program.

Mr. JONAS. Where did you get your A. & E.'s at Meridian?

Admiral PELTIER. I would have to look that up. It is generally a combine of A. & E.'s. I know some people from Jackson are in there.

(The information follows:)

Reynolds Smith & Hills, & Thomas B. Bourne, Jacksonville, Fla.
Turner & Connell Associates, Jackson, Miss.

Mr. JONAS. How many different A. & E.'s do you use in the Los Angeles area?

Admiral PELTIER. There are many A. & E.'s in the Los Angeles area. In the San Diego district I would say they used A. & E.'s from Los Angeles, San Diego, and many of the small cities around Los Angeles—pretty good A. & E.'s.

Mr. JONAS. You do not have one firm doing all the work?

Admiral PELTIER. No, sir.

Mr. JONAS. That is all.

OBLIGATIONAL PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEAR 1961

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you contemplating for obligation by quarters in fiscal year 1961?

Admiral PELTIER. Obligations, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Admiral PELTIER. Our obligations follow a curve rather than a straight line. We start out rather slow and we end up rather fast. This is because our final plans and specifications sometimes are not completed until about the first of the calendar year. However, for fiscal year 1961 we are now going out for final plans and specifications much earlier than last year.

In fact, we have directed our field offices to go out now on many of them. One of the problems in getting good plans is the amount of time given to the A. & E. We know by starting this program earlier we might have a few fallouts, but not many. This program is so tight I do not think we will have many fallouts and we do feel that we will have better plans and specs by going out early.

In answer to your specific question, we will obligate about one-third of our program by January 1, 1961; probably not quite on a straight line, so the first quarter we will obligate, I would say, 15 percent, by the second quarter we will have 33 percent, by the end of the third quarter next year, I hope to have around 65 percent, maybe a little more. Normally we obligate 40 percent of our work in the last quarter. That would mean that we would have 60 percent by the end of the third quarter. I think next year we can do a little better. I hope we can.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that literally due in all instances to the lack of your A. & E. work or is it proportionally due to an accumulation of factors other than that, to which one might be a contributing factor, to wit, your money being expended to you as rapidly as you can spend it in the respective quarters?

Admiral PELTIER. The money is not released in terms of quarters but the re-review of these programs after the money is appropriated by Congress is quite an administrative item. There is always some chance of somebody saying no and it takes awhile to get over those hurdles.

Apportionment is a factor, but not too much. It has been pretty much a matter of plans and specifications. In a lot of these cases we have not started plans and specifications until June or July. Some of these projects take 6, 8, 9, 10 months to develop so that means we will not go out for bids until April or May or even June.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would there be any contribution in that delay in your A. & E. work due to the fact that perhaps the A. & E. people who are very well qualified had a backlog of work or did not have enough manpower to do the job and get it out in reasonable time?

Admiral PELTIER. That should not be a factor. That is one of the things an A. & E. selection board looks into, what is the present backlog of work these people have on the boards. That is one of the factors they use in selecting the A. & E.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How does your present quarterly obligation schedule compare with the estimated one at the time of last year's hearings, comparing last year with this?

Admiral PELTIER. Our 1960 obligation is following pretty close to the predicted schedule, and right now we are a little bit above the curve, maybe 10 million above our projection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is an improvement over last year.

Admiral PELTIER. Yes.

We do not have as much money obligated, because we have a smaller program this year, but percentagewise we are up about 5 percent over last year's rate.

NAVAL WEAPONS PLANT

Mr. SHEPPARD. Just what do you plan to do with the naval weapons plant, if you know?

Mr. MILNE. We haven't yet decided, Mr. Chairman. We have a report which was presented to us about 3 weeks ago by an outside group. We are evaluating that report so that we hope within the next 10 days or 2 weeks at the outside to come to a decision. That report covered all seven of the naval ordnance plants.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would keep this committee informed of that procedure as you go along and make decisions; will you, please?

Mr. MILNE. I will be glad to.

ACQUISITION OF WHERRY HOUSING

Mr. SHEPPARD. One more question having to do with policy. How many Wherry projects do you contemplate buying in this coming fiscal year?

Admiral PELTIER. Two, I think.

Mr. MILNE. We have two, due to the Capehart provision that will force us to acquire the Wherries. That will leave us with 24 projects, a total of 6,734 units which we have no present plans to acquire.

Mr. SIKES. Where are those two?

Mr. MILNE. One is Camp Pendleton, Mr. Sikes.

Admiral PELTIER. And Memphis.

Mr. MILNE. Yes, Memphis is the other.

Mr. SIKES. What is the situation at Green Cove Springs, Fla.? The project seems to be in some trouble. I am just interested to know what your plans are, if any, regarding that.

Mr. MILNE. The present plan of CNO is not to acquire it.

Admiral CHEW. There is no requirement for it at present, sir.

ACQUISITION COST EXPERIENCES

Mr. SHEPPARD. I presume, Mr. Secretary, you or your staff have checked over the experiences in the purchase of the Wherry projects as those experiences are indicated by other services equally as well as your own?

Mr. MILNE. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What do you find the percentage differences between those that you buy or contemplate buying against the so-called congressional formula process and against those that have gone into courts because of condemnation in which the courts have acted on, even though the cases are under appeal? What percentage of increase above formula has been reflected in those cases, if you have made a survey in that field?

Mr. MILNE. There have been no court cases settled on Navy projects. Only two have actually gone to trial.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is not my question, Mr. Secretary. Have you surveyed the experience of the Army, Navy, and Air Force in this

field so as a policy you would have established policy to protect the taxpayers' money, because it is clearly indicated, where we have gone to condemnation in every court proceeding I have listed, and I have every one of them with the exception of two, possibly. I grant they are going on the basis of appeal because of what the lower courts awarded, but if those lower courts awards are analyzed, and you look at that award figure and then look at the formula figure as established by the Congress, do you find an increase of some 28 percent average?

Mr. MILNE. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am being conservative in that.

Admiral PELTIER. The average run 31 percent above formula as of February 15.

Mr. MILNE. We are continuing to negotiate wherever we can. So far we have been reasonably successful.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is all part of the function. There is no misunderstanding about that. I think that is proper procedure. You have to do that. When it comes to finalization of your decision, within the Navy, I think that it might be well if you have not done it you would take a back check on those things and see what experience is there and see how close the formula is justified in being to avoid an excessive charge over here, because of these cases sustained.

Admiral PELTIER. As you know, Mr. Chairman, we have bought 24 projects. Of that 24 we negotiated 11. We condemned 13. Of the 13, the Department of Justice negotiated 3.

We have paid 72 percent of formula. Our board that does this negotiation has reviewed the Army and Air Force court experience. I am sure that will be a factor in their negotiations but we still feel the method we are using in which we get two appraisals and negotiate with the Wherry owner, through the board that we have centralized here in Washington, is a very sound method and we propose to continue. Maybe if we are a little further apart in future negotiations we might split the difference a little sooner than we have in the past, but in some cases we cannot even begin to get together with the Wherry unit owner because he is way over formula and won't come down. Then there is no use in talking. We go to condemnation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is a waste of time. Once that is clearly established by the owners of the project, there is nothing else for you to do if you are in that position.

However, as long as negotiations are prevalent and there is a chance to settle it, it would seem to me that under the law of averages as presently indicated, you would be far better off if you stuck pretty close to formula instead of trying to go too much below formula.

Admiral PELTIER. In our normal property acquisition, in our real estate acquisition we have a record in which our estimate was $935,000 and the courts judgments were $969,000. In other words, we are fairly close to what the courts adjudicated. In fact, it is less than 5 percent.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Out of the total of negotiations that you just indicated a moment ago—I do not recall your figure——

Admiral PELTIER. This is the property acquisition, land, real estate.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This question is directed strictly to Wherry aspects. Did you mean Wherry projects when we were discussing that?

Admiral PELTIER. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How many did you say, 13 went to condemnation?

Admiral PELTIER. Yes. The Department of Justice settled three of those. We did not have our board set up then. We might have done a little better if we had had it. Justice negotiated three. There are 10 that will eventually go to court.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Out of those 10, how many of the owners said no, they would not take formula?

What was the total amount of that that you still could not negotiate?

Admiral PELTIER. I do not have with me the tabulation of how we stood on that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Supply it for the record.

(The information requested follows:)

During negotiations on the 10 Navy Wherry projects now in condemnation, none of the sponsors unequivocally stated that they would not accept the formula price. Five of the sponsors stated that they would not accept less than the formula. The lowest acceptable prices mentioned by the other five sponsors were below formula. However, in all 10 cases negotiated settlement was precluded by the prohibitive disparity between the lowest price acceptable to the sponsor and the highest possible valuation that could be supported by the Navy.

Admiral PELTIER. Probably five of those, just as a guess, we may have been 25 percent over.

In other words, they wanted possibly $1 million and we were up to $750,000. That is figuring higher than anything we probably paid, but I am quite sure that for at least half of those there was no chance to negotiate.

Mr. MILNE. We have a statement which we can supply for the record, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would at this point. I think that would clarify it.

Mr. MILNE. It shows the formula, negotiated price and the sponsor's lowest offer; and in some cases the sponsor's lowest offer is so far apart from our appraisals that we are just not even in the same ball park. In some cases it is twice as much.

(See statement submitted for record above.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you feel under the circumstances that your experience indicates that you have always had the benefit of an appraisal that is comparable with perhaps other appraisals?

Mr. MILNE. We always get two appraisers, don't we, Admiral?

Admiral PELTIER. I think our appraisals are very good, Mr. Chairman, as witnessed from the real estate record, the judgment of the court.

We are using generally the same caliber of people.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you are within the formula range and keep yourselves reasonably close to it, and don't have to go to condemnation, you are better off. These condemnation proceedings show up later on. We are going to have to spend another million and a half or $2 million because you got arbitrary below formula. If you do that we will have an argument with you because I think there is a point here where it is advisable sometimes to give the 30 percent to save the 60 or the 90.

Admiral PELTIER. We certainly will take that into account in all of our negotiations. The only ones we had to buy so far this year we bought. We did not have to go to condemnation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Further questions on the general statement, Mr. Sikes?

Mr. SIKES. Yes.

NAVAL WEAPONS PLANT

Are the studies which are underway on the Navy Gun Factory, Mr. Secretary, designed to establish an alternate use for the Navy Gun Factory or to determine that the work which is being done at some other naval installation can be done better at the Navy Gun Factory?

Mr. MILNE. Yes. That is the type of study.

Mr. SIKES. A combination?

Mr. MILNE. A combination. We have seven plants. It is pretty clear to us we do not need all seven. It is a matter of weighing one against the other and deciding which makes the most efficient combination.

Mr. SIKES. You had made a decision to close the Navy Gun Factory, had you not?

Mr. MILNE. We never came definitely to that conclusion. There has been a lot of talk in the papers about it, but there has been no decision.

Mr. SIKES. You have never decided what you will do with it?

Mr. MILNE. That is right.

Mr. SIKES. You have one more than you need?

Mr. MILNE. I think at least one more than we need.

Mr. SIKES. So the decision is which can most appropriately be closed?

Mr. MILNE. That is right.

Mr. SIKES. What types of considerations will you weigh in that decision?

Mr. MILNE. Well, the overall efficiency, the cost per man-hour, the physical layout of the plant. The gun factory, as you know, is very poorly laid out by modern standards. Some of the buildings are over a hundred years old. Their manufacturing operations are carried on in about 42 different buildings which means terrific transportation costs and that type of thing, whereas the other plants are all built since 1941. I visited all but one of them and they are modern, one-story plants, reasonably well—well, in fact, very well laid out in some cases.

Mr. SIKES. When is it anticipated that a decision will be reached?

Mr. MILNE. I would think it would be this month, Mr. Sikes.

Mr. SIKES. Of course, from the Navy's standpoint, the more quickly you can arrive at a decision which you feel you can support the better it is going to be, don't you think?

Mr. MILNE. That is right. Frankly, I think we have perhaps temporized with the thing a little too long and that is why we are trying to mail it down and come up with a concrete decision.

INACTIVATIONS

Mr. SIKES. I think you are wise in doing that.

Due to budget restrictions and changes and different programs the Navy is faced with the prospect of a shrinking establishment. What has the Navy done with regard to thinking out the probable necessity for other closures that will be necessary in the next year or two?

Mr. MILNE. To give you an example, we are starting a study on our 11 shipyards, talking about industrial facilities. As I say, we have already done, or we just completed the basic study on the seven ordnance plants. Insofar as other facilities are concerned, I think two of the things I mentioned in my statement here will help us to clarify the matter. One is the long-range plan which is now given to the field so they have some terms of reference. They are not dreaming or planning out in the wild blue yonder. The other is the studies that have been started in Norfolk and San Diego to actually sit down and match up the facilities, building by building, without any regard to who has theoretical ownership of them, whether they be BuWeps or BuShips or any other Bureau.

As far as the operational end of it, that is in the CNO's field as to naval stations and those things, but those also are being studied.

Mr. SIKES. Do you have for this committee a list of the bases which are under consideration for closure or has it reached the stage where you can provide such a list?

Mr. MILNE. I do not think it has reached that stage yet, Mr. Sikes.

Mr. SIKES. Isn't there a danger that you are going to be building one set of bases while you are preparing to close out another set of bases?

Mr. MILNE. We are watching that very closely. That comes up in all the reviews before we ever come up here.

Mr. SIKES. Are there no bases which at this time are firmly marked for closure?

Mr. MILNE. I know of none.

Admiral CHEW. There are none at the present time, Mr. Sikes.

Mr. SIKES. When do you anticipate you will have to close some bases?

Admiral CHEW. I do not think I could anticipate, Mr. Sikes.

Mr. SIKES. There is no question in your mind, is there, that under the present plans for future naval operations but that you will have too many bases in your complex?

Admiral CHEW. I have just been given the report, that the future disestablishments that have been approved—you were not speaking of those. I can list the future disestablishments.

Mr. SIKES. Have they already been listed for the public?

Admiral CHEW. Yes, sir. They have been listed in the hearings on appropriations for fiscal year 1961, sir.

Mr. SIKES. What are those?

Admiral CHEW. They start with MSTS, NORPAC, Sub Area; Naval Ammunition Depot, Fort Mifflin; Retraining Command, Camp Elliott, Calif.; Retraining Command, Camp Langdon, N.H.; Reserve Fleet Group, New London; the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Brownsfield, Chula Vista, Calif.; the Naval Air Facility at Annapolis; the Naval Air Station, Anacostia; that is for fixed wing aircraft flight operations only; Naval Ammunition Depot at Hingham, Mass.; the Naval Air Station, Oakland, Calif.; Naval Ammunition Depot at Shumaker, Ark.; the Naval Ordnance Plant at Pocatello, Idaho; the Naval Ammunicition Depot at Hastings, Nebr.

Those have been listed, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Over what time period will those be disestablished?

Admiral CHEW. Between 1960 and 1966.

Mr. SIKES. Calendar or fiscal?

Admiral CHEW. Fiscal, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Are any of these to be used for any future Navy program?

Admiral CHEW. We have always studied the possibility of using any existing facility to satisfy a new requirement so that I would say, as a matter of fact, Mr. Sikes, the closure of the Retraining Command for example, has been done as a consolidation or shrinkage in which we effect considerable savings. So that I would say we have considered the closing of these establishments in connection with our new requirements.

Mr. SIKES. Are you in position to say that none of these which are to be disestablished can be used as a substitute for any of the construction items that are in this fiscal 1961 program?

Admiral CHEW. I could say unequivocally, yes; they have been considered and are not suitable.

POSSIBLE USE OF FACILITIES EXCESS TO OTHER SERVICE

Mr. SIKES. To what extent have you explored the possibility of obtaining facilities from the other services which are due for closing and which might be used in lieu of new construction?

Admiral CHEW. We have always done that. Any disposal action by another service——

Mr. SIKES. Do you have a list of the bases which the Air Force proposes to relinquish in the next few years?

Admiral CHEW. I think we could provide a list for you. I do not know of any.

Mr. SIKES. We have a list; but do you have a list?

Admiral CHEW. Yes, sir. The ones they have notified they plan to close; yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Do you have an actual notification from the other services of the bases which they propose to relinquish?

Admiral CHEW. I have an officer in my division who is the coordinating officer for post closings within the Air Force and he has continuously gone to the Air Force to determine what bases they would close.

Mr. SIKES. I assume he has found nothing in the Air Force inventory of probable closures that interest the Navy?

Admiral CHEW. That is correct.

Mr. MILNE. And they are reviewed again, Mr. Sikes, in Mr. Bryant's shop in OSD. There is a final review there. They have come to us. OSD has called us about things, notably, Bong Air Force Base. I said, "We are sorry. We have no need for that one."

Mr. SIKES. Ordinarily do you get this information in time to be of any real value to you?

By the time you get this information, are you too far along with your own program to utilize it? For instance, if I may clarify my question, you are not starting new bases now. You are adding to existing bases so that the fact that a base is going to be closed at "X" location is normally of little interest to you because you do not need a new base. Is that about the size of it?

Mr. MILNE. Yes. That applied in the case of Bong because we have Glenview, which is just about 50 miles away.

Mr. SIKES. If you get this information several years in advance, it might be worth more to you?

Mr. MILNE. It might be. Take in the case of Hastings which we decided to close last year, the Air Force took a long and hard look at that and very nearly took it off our hands. Then they were going to use it for the development of MINUTEMAN. There were some changes and they are going to use REDSTONE or some place like that but we almost made a sale.

POSSIBILITY OF FUTURE EXCESS OF FACILITIES IN NAVAL AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Mr. SIKES. Are you concerned about the situation which is developing in the Naval Air Training Command where it appears that you are going to have an excess of facilities within the next 2 years?

Admiral CHEW. Mr. Sikes, we are always reviewing what facilities we can use. I think I would be silly to say that if there is a shrinkage in pilot training, in aircraft procurement, in operating funds, we would not be forced and are not forced continually to look at our operating stations.

Mr. SIKES. Let us go into precise detail a little bit. A few years ago when it was anticipated that you were going to all jet trainers, you foresaw a need for more air space and you started a new base at Meridian and you programed one at Brewton, Ala. Then before you got very far with Meridian and before you did anything at Brewton, it became evident that you were overprograming due to the changing picture and you canceled plans for Brewton but continued the one at Meridian.

Now you are faced with the prospect of a still further cutback in pilot training plus the fact that you are staying in props for a part of your training all of which has further changed your naval air training requirements. There is very strong likelihood that by the time you complete Meridian you are going to have too much in the way of facilities.

I do not know whether you are blameless in this or not because you have continued to build at Meridian beyond the date that it became apparent that you would not need all of the facilities you will have available. What are you going to do in a year or two when all of this new complex is available?

Admiral CHEW. Let me go back just a little bit further, sir.

In addition to Meridian there is another base at new Iberia.

Mr. SIKES. That one has not been there very long.

Admiral CHEW. It was just commissioned this year, sir. It was built and it was also designed originally for jet operations. When it become evident that it would not be needed for that, we came before the committees of the Congress and requested authority to reprogram in order to cut back and use New Iberia for prop type aircraft. It has now been completed on a reduced scale at a considerable savings.

In further answer to your question, we have done the same with Meridian.

Mr. SIKES. What is the location of the planes that go into New Iberia?

Admiral CHEW. The planes that are going into New Iberia were being based in Texas.

Mr. SIKES. What did you close in Texas to make way for a new base in New Iberia?

Admiral CHEW. We have closed nothing in Texas.

Mr. SIKES. You have reduced activities in Texas in order to use this new base at New Iberia?

Admiral CHEW. That is correct, sir.

Mr. SIKES. What operations did you reduce in Texas?

Admiral CHEW. I would like Captain Bridgers to answer specifically, sir.

Captain BRIDGERS. Mr. Sikes, what was the question, sir?

Mr. SIKES. What bases in Texas were reduced in scope in order that New Iberia could be made operational?

Captain BRIDGERS. None, sir, South Kingsville will be.

Mr. SIKES. One auxiliary will be closed?

Captain BRIDGERS. A portion of an auxiliary, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Why did you close that one instead of stopping work on New Iberia?

Captain BRIDGERS. Because, sir, that field is a portion of an auxiliary field. The operating surface and the plant condition generally of that portion of Kingsville are in very poor shape.

Mr. SIKES. It was built when?

Captain BRIDGERS. Built in 1942, I think, sir.

Mr. SIKES. World War II construction?

Captain BRIDGERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Altogether?

Captain BRIDGERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. What type of runways?

Captain BRIDGERS. It has asphaltic concrete runways.

Mr. SIKES. What will you do with South Kingsville?

Captain BRIDGERS. We plan to close it, sir, but bear in mind that at South Kingsville—Kingsville is a dual field like Whiting—there are two fields. The portion we are talking about is the south portion.

It would be just shut down, sir.

Mr. SIKES. All right. What else would be reduced or closed in order for New Iberia to become operational?

Captain BRIDGERS. Nothing, sir.

Mr. SIKES. New Iberia will be a small operation then, will it not?

Captain BRIDGERS. Yes, sir. It was planned as a small operation when we cut back, sir.

Mr. SIKES. If you had not commissioned New Iberia, how long could you have continued in the operation of South Kingsville with present-day maintenance costs?

Captain BRIDGERS. I do not think we would have done that, sir. I think we would have moved the planes there to Corpus Christi proper.

Mr. SIKES. Is it planned to move anything else to New Iberia except planes from South Kingsville?

Captain BRIDGERS. Yes, sir; about two-thirds of the jet planes now at Forest Sherman, Pensacola.

Mr. SIKES. We have been told recently that the planes from Pensacola are to go to Meridian, not New Iberia.

Captain BRIDGERS. May I correct that, I misunderstood the question.

Mr. SIKES. What goes to New Iberia?

Captain BRIDGERS. Nothing else.

Mr. SIKES. How large will the operation at New Iberia be?

Captain BRIDGERS. A maximum of 50 airplanes.

Mr. SIKES. That is an expensive base for 50 prop airplanes, is it not?

Captain BRIDGERS. I think not, sir.

Mr. SIKES. What is the cost of the base?

Admiral CHEW. $24 million, sir.

Mr. SIKES. You do not consider that an excessive cost for the operation of 50 prop trainers?

Captain BRIDGERS. No, sir; not when you consider what they are doing and the airspace improvement that they have there.

Mr. SIKES. What other changes do you anticipate? What will happen when you commission Meridian?

Captain BRIDGERS. It is planned to put 125 basic jet aircraft into Meridian.

Mr. SIKES. Where will you get them?

Captain BRIDGERS. From a unit now located at Memphis, which will go in the interim to South Kingsville.

Mr. SIKES. What will you do with the facilities at Memphis?

Captain BRIDGERS. That move will have no effect on the facilities at Memphis. They are up there now, very disadvantageously, Memphis is a large station where we wish to consolidate the bulk of the Technical Training Command. Most of it is there now. This was a load superimposed upon them for lack of facilities.

Mr. SIKES. How long have they been there?

Captain BRIDGERS. They have been there about 2 years, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Where will you get the others?

Captain BRIDGERS. From Pensacola, sir.

Mr. SIKES. You will take some 60 odd planes out of Pensacola?

Captain BRIDGERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. What will you put in Pensacola in place of them?

Captain BRIDGERS. Nothing, sir.

Mr. SIKES. That means you will have unused space at Pensacola?

Captain BRIDGERS. No, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Why not? You mean you can take out two-thirds of a command and not have unused space as a result of it?

Captain BRIDGERS. It depends on what you mean by "space," Mr. Sikes. The planes there now are combined at Forest Sherman with O. & R. test facilities, considerable miscellaneous activity; all of the instructor training and transients and administrative flying, sir, and that is a very undesirable situation. The field was not intended for that, sir. We are using it because we have the aircraft now. We are trying to get on with the training program and I think the sooner we get them out, the better.

Mr. SIKES. What did you do with the training that was carried on at Corry Field, Pensacola, prior to this?

Captain BRIDGERS. Corry is 2 miles from Forest Sherman. It is completely impossible to conduct any flight operations with those two fields as they are, sir. Corry field is, as you know, being turned into a communications school and part of the land there is being excessed.

Mr. SIKES. It is not your feeling that there will be any excess facilities in the area other than at South Kingsville as a result of these shifts and as a result of the opening of two new bases?

Captain BRIDGERS. That is right, sir. It is my feeling that there will be no excess facilities.

Mr. SIKES. Do you foresee a continued requirement for North Kingsville, for Corpus Christi, and for Chase?

Captain BRIDGERS. Sir, as far as we have gone with the training rate and the training aircraft that we foresee we do not see any reduction in those bases.

Mr. SIKES. If it should be found that you have more facilities than you require, what will be the bases closed in the Naval Air Training Command and in what order?

Captain BRIDGERS. That has not been worked out, sir.

Mr. SIKES. What are the facilities at Chase?

Captain BRIDGERS. The facilities at Chase are 50 percent modern and about 50 percent World War II, sir.

Mr. SIKES. What are the facilities at North Kingsville?

Captain BRIDGERS. They are somewhat on a par. I would say if there is any choice it is slightly in favor of North Kingsville insofar as all facilities are concerned. The runway system is vastly superior.

Mr. SIKES. What is the future of Corpus Christi proper?

Captain BRIDGERS. I do not foresee any change in that, Mr. Sikes.

Mr. SIKES. You are planning to move out of Memphis. Will that take all of the jet training out of Memphis?

Captain BRIDGERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. You have closed Barin, you have closed Corry, you plan to close South Kingsville, to move two-thirds of your jets out of Pensacola. It appears to me that is because you built more unneeded facilities.

Captain BRIDGERS. I think not, sir. I think the move out of the Pensacola area of approximately 60 jets is a very sensible thing and that we will have vastly improved air space at Meridian, which I think is an overriding consideration.

Mr. SIKES. To what extent have possible base closures been written into the 5-year plan which you discussed, Mr. Secretary?

Captain BRIDGERS. May I answer that?

Mr. MILNE. Yes.

Captain BRIDGERS. In preparing the 5-year plan, Mr. Sikes, we have considered runouts almost to the ridiculous; that is, in a declining operating aircraft program. By virtue of that, we have estimated those bases which we need as long as there is a naval aviation and those which would be needed at various stages. It is purely a study. It is not a plan, but based on that information the Bureau of Naval Weapons has been given guidance on which stations they can submit military construction projects for and some of those are the ones that are found in this program.

(Classified listing was provided the committee.)

REPROGRAMING ACTIONS

Mr. SIKES. I would like to know why the Navy has found it necessary to do a considerable amount of reprograming within months after a supposedly firm program was submitted to this committee for construction in the fiscal year 1960 budget.

We found some very important items eliminated after you had assured us that there was a very positive need for those items. If the Navy's decision regarding its needs was no more firm than that a year ago, how can we be sure this is going to be a firm program?

Admiral CHEW. Mr. Sikes, I would like to answer that.

I think there is a need for reprograming when we are essentially in a dollar-for-dollar funding area. I know you are speaking of the reprograming action in which we requested eight line items be approved. If you will remember, sir, three of them were emergent. I would hesitate to say that you could not foresee that a runway, and I speak now of the runway at Patuxent, which was one of the reprograming items, that we could not have foreseen that it was going to go beyond economical repair, but in a tight budget area you try to fix it, you try to fix it, you try to fix it, and then suddenly—it isn't sudden, but you do realize you reach the point of diminishing returns. We had no way of accomplishing that unless we reprogramed by the rules of the committee. In other words, an item had to drop from the 1960 program in order to accomplish those. We still have other urgent items and later on in the hearings of the committee, based upon requirements and urgency, I would like permission to substitute items that you have already approved, both for funding and have been authorized, for which we have no funds. Consequently, it becomes a matter of urgency as to which individual item should be done.

I think that is the reason for a reprograming because we have no flexibility now, sir.

Mr. SIKES. This is a difficult field. The committee certainly does not want you to proceed to build or to construct a facility if you have found that there is no requirement for it. We know that some months must elapse between the authorization and the funding and the construction. There are some months between the justification in the Navy and the presentation to Congress.

These things change. The committee does not want you to proceed blindly if the Bureau thinks they are not needed, but it is somewhat puzzling to me on occasion when an item appears to be very firmly in the required category and then it is found it is not.

Let me ask you about this apparent policy of waiting until late in the fiscal year to fund items which have been authorized and for which money has been appropriated. It would appear to us that you would save money by going ahead with construction, since prices generally are tending upwards. It certainly appears if you need an item enough to have it included in this program that you would want to put it under construction as soon as possible.

Most of the things that we approve do not seem to get started insofar as funding in the Department and award of bid is concerned until late in the fiscal year.

Is that something you have any control over or is it something that comes from higher authority and that you have to live with?

Mr. MILNE. I think Admiral Peltier covered that earlier, Mr. Sikes.

Admiral PELTIER. It is a matter of getting the plans and specifications finalized and out for bids.

Mr. SIKES. There is a feeling up here that a good part of that is to make the budget look as good as you can as long as it can and this all comes from higher authority.

You are not in positon to talk about that?

Admiral PELTIER. On this particular program this year there is no limitation on expenditures. We can go as fast as we have plans and specs ready. This is for this year.

Mr. SIKES. Some of the plans and specs that I am thinking of were rather simple. They were not particularly time consuming. Why would a thing like conversion of barracks not be funded until the fourth quarter?

Admiral PELTIER. You are thinking of Corry Field?

Mr. SIKES. Yes.

Admiral PELTIER. I would have to look into that to see what was the cause. However, some of those renovations, Mr. Sikes, are much more complicated than a new building. We have to go in and review the existing structure. Our requirements are generally not as firm. We have to work out the requirements with the people who are going to use this facility and in this particular case they are out in California, so it could very well be just the liaison of that which delayed it 3 ot 4 months.

We have to check our existing utility systems and things like that. That could take, sometimes, more time.

It is more costly to engineer than a new building. You can hardly ever get the price, dollar-for-dollar, percentagewise, for the A. & E. that you can for a new structure.

Mr. SIKES. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, gentlemen.

SURVEY OF ORDNANCE AND WEAPON PLANT AT POCATELLO, IDAHO

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Secretary, do the seven ordnance plants include the one at Pocatello?

Mr. MILNE. No.

Mr. JONAS. That would be eight?

Mr. MILNE. Yes.

Mr. JONAS. You decided to close it out several years ago?

Mr. MILNE. That is right.

Mr. JONAS. A year ago I asked you if any progress had been made toward releasing some of these facilities for private use pending the complete phaseout. Can you give me any more information on that at this time?

Mr. MILNE. Yes. It is in the hands of the GSA and they are negotiating with one or two outside people who might be interested in taking over the facilities.

Mr. JONAS. You are not completely out at Pocatello?

Mr. MILNE. Not completely. We have some heavy guns there and we told GSA if they could find a tenant or a purchaser we would get out.

Mr. JONAS. I asked that question last year on behalf of the people out there who are anxious to have some progress made toward making those facilities available for civilian use.

Mr. MILNE. We have told the people we will be completely flexible if they could find anybody who could use it on a rental or sale basis.

NAVAL WEAPONS PLANT

Mr. JONAS. Did I understand you to tell the chairman the Navy has not definitely decided to give up the Naval Weapons Plant?

Mr. MILNE. That is correct. That is a decision we expect to make this month.

Mr. JONAS. Who is responsible for all the newspaper comment?

Mr. MILNE. I do not know. They phone Mr. Bantz or me once a week with new rumors. Where they generate, we do not know.

Mr. JONAS. I may be mistaken, but I thought I had read a statement from the Office of the Secretary definitely stating the Navy had no plans for further use of that installation and that it would be so declared.

Mr. MILNE. It was not put as precisely as that. I think Mr. Franke was asked at one of the hearings and he said we did not see a continuing use of the complete facilities. I do not know his exact words. But the decision is definitely not made yet.

UTILIZATION OF FACILITIES PREVIOUSLY USED BY OTHER SERVICES

Mr. JONAS. Can you give us any examples for the record of any cases in which you have taken over, in whole or in part, any facility previously used by either of the other services and surrendered as a result of this continuing contact you say you maintain within the services?

Admiral CHEW. We have one fine example of a tremendous saving as the result of taking over the Air Force base at Yuma. Port Arguello was also taken over from the Army. The taking over of the Air Force base at Yuma effected a tremendous saving.

Mr. JONAS. Those are cases where you took over intact a complete installation?

Admiral CHEW. Yes.

Mr. JONAS. Can you give examples for the record of where you have taken over part of a facility?

Admiral CHEW. This might be considered a part of a facility, Mr. Jonas. We have taken over part of the Eglin Air Force Base outlying fields for use by Whiting Field, for example. Another example is Fort Miles at Lewes, Del., which we are taking over from the Army.

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to have those examples for the record because we are constantly being asked by Members about what is being done and for concrete examples.

STATUS OF PROJECTS DECLARED IN EXCESS DURING 1959

Mr. Secretary, you stated on page 5 of your statement that

> during the last calendar year, 112 properties containing over 127,000 acres and having an acquisition cost of approximately $453 million.

have been reported as excess to your requirements.

Mr. MILNE. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. What is the status of those installations now?

Mr. MILNE. They are in various stages. We can provide that for the record.

Mr. JONAS. Your statement did not indicate how far along they are toward ultimate disposition.

Mr. MILNE. I think that can be provided for the record, Mr. Jonas.

Admiral CHEW. We can furnish a list of those for the record.

Mr. JONAS. That will show the progress.

Admiral CHEW. Yes, sir.

(The following list was submitted for the record:)

Projects declared excess to Navy requirements in fiscal year 1959, submitted by Bureau of Yards and Docks

State	Project description	Acres and improvements	Acquisition cost	Status as of Mar. 31, 1960
Alabama	NAAS, Barin Field, Foley	11.57 acres	$391,000	To GSA, June 29, 1959.
	OLF Wolf No. 27016, Baldwin Co	48.53 acres	684	Do.
Arkansas	NAD Shumaker, Camden	64,175.74 acres	124,410,000	To GSA, Feb. 26, 1960.
California	Portion of Naval Hospital, Corona	115 acres	7,641,000	To House Armed Services Committee, June 19, 1959.
	NRC, Camp Elliott, San Diego	26,722 acres	494,000	To Armed Services Committee, Mar. 22, 1960.
	Fort Rosecrans Military Reservation (San Diego), Point Loma	43 acres	None	Public domain land. Returned to Interior, Jan. 14, 1960.
	MCAAS Mojave	2,998 acres	9,390,000	To GSA, Jan. 15, 1960.
	Torrance annex of Long Beach Naval Shipyard	26.06 acres	106,000	To GSA, Nov. 17, 1959.
	Capehart housing project, Chesterton, San Diego	.90 acres		To GSA, Sept. 18, 1959.
	MCB Camp Pendleton	67.23 acres	2,000	To GSA, Aug. 14, 1959.
	Trust property, Riverside, Mojave	80 acres		To GSA, July 17, 1959.
	Portion of NAS Moffett Field	75.64 acres		To GSA, Feb. 10, 1960.
	Islais Creek Area, MCSFA San Francisco	90.21 acres	3,522,000	To GSA, Dec. 3, 1959.
	NAS Oakland, parcel 7 (leased)	None	992,000	To GSA, Nov. 25, 1959.
	Portion of Kwajalein Village defense housing project, Stockton	.69 acres	1,000	To GSA, July 23, 1959.
	Naval facility, San Bruno	54 acres	4,675,000	To GSA, Aug. 3, 1959.
	NIRS Alameda	23.70 acres	4,935,000	To GSA, Sept. 9, 1959.
	Fort Cronkhite, San Francisco	161 acres		To GSA, July 15, 1959.
	NIRAP Torrance, 190th St. drainage ditch (DOD No. 450)	10.459 acres		To GSA, Nov. 17, 1959.
	NIR repair facility, DOD No. 40, Oakland	3 buildings	491,425	To GSA, Oct. 30, 1959.
	Former OLF Santa Rosa (portion)	31.4 acres	17,900	To GSA, Aug. 14, 1959.
Colorado	NAS Buckley Field, Denver	3,588 acres	11,383,000	Transferred to Air Force, Oct. 21, 1959.
Connecticut	Norden Division, United Aircraft plant 2, Milford	1 building	427,749	To GSA, June 17, 1959.
	Groton, DOD No. 59	None	5,450,000	To GSA, Nov. 13, 1959.
Delaware	NIRS Wilmington, DOD No. 63	118 acres	8,721,000	To GSA, July 6, 1959.
Florida	OLF Pace	640 acres	32,000	To GSA, Oct. 22, 1959.
	MCAS Miami	4,254.61 acres	23,030,000	To GSA, June 22, 1959.
	NIRS Panama City	118 acres	3,736,000	To GSA, June 23, 1959.
	OLF Bronson, NAS Pensacola	3 buildings	355,041	To GSA, July 6, 1959.
	Portion of former NAS Vero Beach	4.61 acres and 1 building.	9,505	To GSA, July 2, 1959.
	NAS Cecil Field	1 building	60,620	To GSA, Dec. 29, 1959.
	do	2 buildings	187,042	To GSA, July 21, 1959.
	NAS Jacksonville	11 buildings	616,546	To GSA, Oct. 26, 1959.
	Former MCAS Miami	6.82 acres		To GSA, June 22, 1969.
Foreign	U.S. Naval Communication Station, Barrigada (Mariana area) Guam.	15.50 acres	5,000	To GSA, Sept. 9, 1959.
Georgia	NAS Atlanta	71 acres	5,814,000	To GSA, May 14, 1959. Deeded to DeKalb County.
Hawaii	Waipio Peninsula	185 acres	61,000	To Armed Services Committee Mar. 17, 1960. Senate approved, Mar. 28, 1960.
	NSC Ewa	175 acres		Transferred to Commerce, Nov. 24, 1959.

Projects declared excess to Navy requirements in fiscal year 1959, submitted by Bureau of Yards and Docks—Continued

State	Project description	Acres and improvements	Acquisition cost	Status as of Mar. 31, 1960
Idaho	NOP Pocatello	15.5 acres	$1,884,000	To GSA, Oct. 15, 1959.
	do	155 acres	15,063,000	To GSA, Mar. 24, 1960.
	do	42.362 acres	19,000	To GSA, June 18, 1959.
Illinois	NAS Glenview		125,247	To GSA, Dec. 31, 1959.
Indiana	NAD Crane		32,358	To GSA, July 1, 1959.
Iowa	NAS Ottumwa	29.12 acres		Transferred to Air Force, Oct. 6, 1959.
Kansas	NAS Hutchinson	2,565.1 acres	378,115	Transferred to Air Force, May 13, 1959.
Louisiana	Portion of Planters Bypass Canal, NAD New Orleans	6.16 acres		To GSA, May 23, 1958. (Sold to various purchasers.)
	NAS Houma	1.01 acres	5,054	To GSA, Oct. 16, 1958.
	do	None (Hortonsphere)		To NAA, Mar. 17, 1959.
	NIRS New Orleans, DOD No. 137	None	8,069,000	To be transferred to Army, July 1, 1960.
Maine	Naval security group activity, Winter Harbor	1.89 acres	1,623	To GSA, June 23, 1959. Sold, Nov. 10, 1959.
	Bass Harbor Head transmitting station		11,102	To GSA, Oct. 23, 1958.
	MCRTC Portland	3.03 acres	101,000	To GSA, Sept. 16, 1959.
	Ram Island, Kittery	3 acres		To GSA, Sept. 29, 1959.
Maryland	Solomons Annex, NAS Patuxent River	None	329,918	To GSA, Jan. 22, 1959.
	Former Piney Point Annex, NGF	.42 acres		To Coast Guard, Sept. 17, 1959.
Massachusetts	Fire Fighting School, "K" Street Annex, NS Boston	3.12 acres	380,000	To GSA, Dec. 16, 1959.
	NIRS Hingham	222 acres	15,405,000	To GSA, Sept. 23, 1959.
Missouri	NAS St. Louis	49.84 acres	3,600,000	To DOD, Nov. 24, 1959.
	NIROP St. Louis, DOD No. 206	3.75 acres	4,212,000	Approved by CNO.
	N&MCRTC, St. Louis	9.8 acres	527,000	To GSA, Oct. 7, 1959.
Nebraska	Portion of NAD Hastings	10,556 acres	862,000	To DOD, Aug. 25, 1959.
	Portion of NAD Hastings	194.86 acres	2,473,000	To DOD July 15, 1959.
	NAD Hastings	None	60,507	To GSA, Feb. 3, 1959.
Nevada	NIROP Henderson	200 acres	2,856,000	To GSA, Feb. 8, 1960.
New Hampshire	Northeast corner of former Landon Reservation, New Castle	3 acres	5,000	To GSA, June 23, 1959. Sold, Mar. 14, 1960.
New Jersey	NIRAP Wallington	7 acres	3,067,000	To ASC, Oct. 2. 1959, Senate approved, Oct. 28, 1959.
	NIRS Port Newark	197 acres	17,523,000	To GSA, Mar. 18, 1960.
	NIRAP Teterboro, DOD No. 234	8.70 acres	1,368,000	To GSA, Dec. 16, 1959.
	NIRS Kearny	168.59 acres	19,473,000	To GSA, Mar. 4, 1960.
New York	NIRAP Syosset, DOD No. 270	1.6 acres	37,000	To GSA, July 2, 1959, sold, Mar. 10, 1960.
	NIRAP Buffalo, DOD No. 247	1.25 acres	510,000	To Gsa, Feb. 8, 1960.
	NSD Scotia	337 acres	19,622,000	To GSA, Dec. 4, 1959.
	Military Medical Supply Agency, 84 Sands St., Brooklyn	0.487 acres	1,551,000	To GSA, Dec. 4, 1959.
	NIROP Poughkeepsie	10 acres	1,234,000	To GSA, Oct. 29, 1959.
	NIROP Dresden	31 acres	2,115,000	To GSA, Sept. 4, 1959.
	N&MCRTC Fort Schyler	5 acres	519,000	To DOD, Mar. 14, 1960.
	Naval Hospital, St. Albans	None	1,943,000	DOD approved, Mar. 30, 1960
	Limited production high energy fuel plant, Lewiston	9 acres	4,898,000	Transferred to Air Force.
North Carolina	MC OLF Edenton	3,283 acres	13,386,000	To GSA Sept. 28, 1959.
	NAAS Edenton	22.47 acres	1,856	To GSA Apr. 3, 1959.
	NRTC Raleigh	None	132,201	To GSA July 7, 1959.

Ohio	NAS Columbus	55.79 acres	1,933,000	To GSA June 24, 1959.
	NIRAP North Perry, DOD No. 481	92.5 acres	1,720,000	To DOD Mar. 24, 1960.
	NIROP, Canton, DOD No. 288	118.56 acres	8,822,000	To GSA Dec. 29, 1959.
Oklahoma	NRT facility, Norman	1.06 acres	2,672	To GSA Dec. 18, 1959.
	NATTC Norman	1,143 acres	11,449,000	To GSA Dec. 23, 1959.
Oregon	Walluski housing area, NS Tongue Point, Astoria	3.95 acres	132,000	To GSA Nov. 13, 1959.
Pennsylvania	Naval Aviation Supply Depot, Philadelphia	.51 acres	2,285	To GSA Sept. 1, 1959.
	Lippincott Building, 25th and Locust Street, Philadelphia	.57 acres	494,000	To GSA Dec. 18, 1959.
	NIRS Philadelphia	45.472 acres	19,464,000	To GSA Nov. 12, 1959.
	N & MCRTC Eddystone	2.149 acres	396,000	To GSA Aug. 21, 1959.
	N & MCRTC Reading	22.76 acres	469,000	To GSA Aug. 24, 1959.
	NAD Fort Mifflin	449.5 acres	9,477,000	CNO approved Aug. 11, 1959. Hold for legislation.
South Carolina	NIRS Charleston	19 acres	2,619,000	To GSA June 17, 1959.
Texas	NAS Corpus Christi	None	66,960	To GSA Aug. 24, 1959.
	Naval Security Station, LaPorte	282 acres	28,000	To GSA, Nov. 4, 1959.
Virginia	OLF Creeds Field	272 acres	871,000	To GSA, Jan. 27, 1960.
	Cheapside tower site, Harbor Defense Unit, Little Creek	0.98 acre	17,000	To GSA, Aug. 12, 1959.
	Marine Corps Schools, Quantico	0.126 acre	11,000	To GSA, June 17, 1959.
	NAS Chincoteague	2,368.5 acres	25,600,000	Screening completed.
Virgin Islands	Naval degaussing station on Hassel Island, St. Thomas	4.64 acres		Transferred to V.I. Corp. Sept. 28, 1959; Public Law 85-913.
Washington	NAS Seattle (southwest corner of Sand Point Way and East 65th St.)	6.44 acres	54,000	To GSA, Jan. 13, 1960.
	NIRS Seattle, DOD No. 421 Plant B	19.8 acres	1,514,000	To GSA, Jan. 15, 1960.
	Federal Housing, Hadlock Rd., Bremerton	6.14 acres	90,000	To GSA, Sept. 15, 1959.
	NIRS Everett, DOD No. 414	70.5 acres	4,622,000	To GSA May 11, 1959. Sold Mar. 18, 1960.
	NAS Seattle	None	19,670	To GSA, Sept. 4, 1959.
	Portion of Shearwater Housing Project, NAS Seattle	1.84 acres	6,804	To GSA, July 21, 1959.
	NIRS Tacoma	None	27,366	To GSA, Sept. 29, 1958. Sold Jan. 1, 1960.
	NAS Seattle	9.31 acres	731,869	To GSA, Feb. 9, 1959.
West Virginia	NIROP Huntington, DOD No. 427	10 acres	1,756,000	To GSA, June 17, 1959.
Wisconsin	NIROP Milwaukee, DOD No. 438	5.2 acres	1,344,000	To GSA, Dec. 22, 1959.
District of Columbia	Former U.S. Naval Hospital, 9th and Pennsylvania Ave. SE., Washington, D.C.	0.705 acres	28,000	To Armed Services Committee, Jan. 13, 1960. House approved, Mar. 16, 1960.
Total	112 disposal projects	127,160	454,500,000	

Mr. JONAS. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, Mr. Reporter, taking up shipyard facilities, insert the summary pages at this point.

(The summary pages referred to follow:)

	Proposed funding	Fiscal year authorization
SHIPYARD FACILITIES INSIDE THE UNITED STATES		
INSTALLATION AND LINE ITEM		
David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Md.: Water distribution system	$206,000	1961
Naval Shipyard, Charleston, S.C.:		
Fire control and navigation buildings	937,000	1961
Alterations to miscellaneous buildings	137,000	1961
Extension to machine shop	369,000	1961
Multipurpose building	498,000	1961
Pier utilities and improvements	414,000	1961
Total	2,355,000	
Naval Facility, Fort Miles, Lewes, Del.:		
Communication facilities	179,000	1961
Terminal equipment building	380,000	1961
Modification to multipurpose structure	80,000	1961
Multipurpose building	282,000	1961
Utilities and services	372,000	1961
Total	1,293,000	
Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn.:		
Improvements to berthing pier	380,000	1961
Dental clinic	358,000	1961
Security Fencing	17,000	1960
Total	755,000	
Navy Underwater Sound Laboratory, New London, Conn.: Undersea warfare research building	4,432,000	1961
Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Submarine attack training building	509,000	1961
Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, N.H.:		
Deepening of berths	695,000	1961
Reconstruction of drydock	5,994,000	1961
Addition to electric distribution system	140,000	1961
Total	6,829,000	
Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, Calif.: Addition to electric distribution system	285,000	1961
Subtotal, shipyard facilities inside the United States	16,664,000	
SHIPYARD FACILITIES OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES		
INSTALLATION AND LINE ITEM		
Naval Facility, Bermuda: Replacement of temporary buildings and enlargement	908,000	1961
Naval Facility, Ramey Air Force Base, P.R.: Terminal equipment building	200,000	1961
Subtotal, shipyard facilities outside the United States	1,108,000	
Total shipyard facilities	17,772,000	

FUNDING PROGRAM

Mr. SHEPPARD. Also insert in the record a statement on the funding program for shipyard facilities for 1961.

(The statement follows:)

Bureau of Ships, Fiscal Year 1961 Military Construction Funding Program

The Bureau of Ships facilities requested in this program include only items considered mandatory for effective support of the operating forces and approved programs. These facilities support four basic objectives, as follows: (1) Provision for construction and operation of nuclear-powered and fleet-ballistic-missile submarines; (2) provision for support of submarine and antisubmarine warfare research and training operations; (3) provision for requirements of our large carriers; and (4) provision for more effective use of our research and development facilities. This program includes facilities at three naval shipyards, two laboratories, two submarine bases, and three oceanographic research stations for a total of 22 items at an estimated cost of $17,772,000.

Our first objective is to continue provision of facilities essential for construction, overhaul, and operation of nuclear-powered and fleet-ballistic-missile submarines. Two fleet-ballistic-missile submarines are in operation, seven are under construction, and three others are included in the fiscal year 1961 budget. Nine other nuclear-powered submarines are in operation, 14 are under construction, and 1 is authorized. All of these ships are heavier, have deeper drafts, and require more utilities capacity for berthing, tender-type upkeep, and for overhaul than do conventional diesel-electric-powered submarines. The fleet-ballistic-missile submarines also have more advanced fire control and navigation equipment, which the naval shipyards are not yet equipped to overhaul. This expanding new submarine fleet has created, and will continue to create, requirements for additional facilities at the Portsmouth and Charleston Naval Shipyards, where these vessels are planned to be repaired and overhauled, and at the New London Submarine Base, where some will be berthed and homeported.

Portsmouth is the Navy's only east coast submarine construction shipyard, and is at present the only naval shipyard on the east coast which can overhaul nuclear-powered submarines. It is now planned to equip the Charleston Naval Shipyard for overhaul of fleet-ballistic-missile submarines and other nuclear-powered submarines in the current program.

Initial facilities at Portsmouth for these new submarines were authorized last year. They consisted of reconstruction of the building ways, berth improvements, and a noise-measurement facility—all of which are either under construction or about to be started. The request this year is for reconstruction of a drydock and further berth improvements, including additional utilities and dredging. Next year's request will include facilities at Portsmouth for overhauling the POLARIS subsystems of fleet-ballistic-missile submarines.

Facilities for the program at the New London Submarine Base have been authorized over the last 3 years and included modernization of the powerplant and communication facilities, reconstruction of piers, and new barracks, including land acquisition. This year we are requesting security fencing authorized last year, utilities improvements and dredging at State pier for berthing nuclear submarines, and a dental clinic which has become a most urgent requirement because of the growing personnel load.

The request for Charleston this year includes only facilities necessary for overhaul of nuclear-powered and fleet-ballistic-missile submarines. Overhaul of the first fleet-ballistic-missile submarine is at present scheduled for early 1963. The items consist of dredging and berthing improvements, additions and alterations to industrial shop buildings, a new fire control and navigation equipment building, and a new multipurpose auxiliary support building.

Summarizing, projects in the program supporting this first objective include three items at the Portsmouth Shipyard at a total cost of $6,829,000, three items at the New London Submarine Base totaling $755,000, and 5 items at the Charlestown Shipyard totaling $2,355,000.

Our second objective is to continue provision of facilities necessary to support submarine and antisubmarine warfare research and training operations. For the past several years the Bureau has been developing a number of oceanographic research stations considered vital to national defense. The necessary haste in establishing the first few of these stations and the need to try out the new equipment precluded construction of permanent-type structures. The Navy has a progressive program of replacing these temporary structures as they grow past their economic life, thereby protecting the delicate electronic equipment which requires controlled temperature and humidity environment for efficient

operation. At the Bermuda and Ramey Air Force Base stations these temporary structures are deteriorated to the extent that the equipment is in danger of damage from the elements. Further, Bermuda is a key station and must be expanded to provide for additional equipment being procured. Not only do we have unsatisfactory temporary facilities at the Cape May station, but steadily encroaching beach erosion might damage the equipment and stop operations during the winter of 1961–62. It is considered that the most economical solution is to relocate the station to Government-owned land at Fort Miles, Lewes, Del., construct some new facilities, and adapt some existing facilities which are available there.

The Underwater Sound Laboratory at New London is presently operating in the old temporary, scattered buildings originally built as a Coast Guard station. These deteriorated structures are not suitable for laboratory operations and cannot be used satisfactorily to bring about the necessary rapid developments in modern electronics, communications, and undersea warfare weapons systems. A new research building to match the accelerating development of these new systems is of vital importance to the expanding programs in submarine and antisubmarine warfare.

The existing submarine attack training facility at the Pearl Harbor Submarine Base was designed for conventional diesel-electric-powered submarines. It is obsolete and practically worthless for modern nuclear-powered submarines. The present building is far too small for installation of the necessary new equipment to simulate modern submarines and fire control equipment. Replacement of this building is now mandatory to support the expanding modern submarine fleet.

Our program request supporting this second objective includes five items for relocation of the naval facility at Fort Miles at a total estimated cost of $1,293,000, a new undersea warfare research building at the Underwater Sound Laboratory estimated to cost $4,432,000, and a new submarine attack trainer building at the Pearl Harbor Submarine Base estimated at $509,000.

Our third objective is to provide urgent facility expansion made mandatory by the growing fleet of large carriers. The drydock and adjacent pier at the San Francisco Naval Shipyard do not have sufficient electrical power capacity to meet the demands of these ships. The required additional power capacity is estimated to cost $285,000.

Our fourth and final objective is to provide additions to the water supply and distribution system at the David Taylor Model Basin for more effective use of our research and development facilities and for adequate fire protection. The research work at this laboratory requires large quantities of water, and the new 20-inch connection will insure that important and costly tests are no longer interrupted and postponed because of low water supply. The additional lines will insure adequate fire protection, and will also permit recirculation and refiltration of water in the wavemaking basin to produce the required clarity for new high-speed underwater photography requirements. These additions to the water system are estimated to cost $206,000.

DAVID TAYLOR MODEL BASIN, CARDEROCK, MD.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The first project is the David Taylor Model Basin at Carderock Md.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
DAVID TAYLOR MODEL BASIN	CARDEROCK, MARYLAND	3865-333

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
WASHINGTON, D.C., 10 MILES SOUTHEAST	MONTGOMERY	BUREAU OF SHIPS	POTOMAC RIVER NAVAL COMMAND

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
NAVAL RESEARCH	1939	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To conduct fundamental, applied, and developmental research to develop: designs of naval vessels which have minimum resistance, satisfactory maneuverability and maximum propulsion efficiency for given military characteristics; designs of propellers for naval vessels and torpedoes; efficient structures of ships; such countermeasures as may be assigned; means for the protection of submarines and surface vessels from the effects of underwater explosions; and to solve various other problems related to the foregoing, such as noise elimination and the reduction of vibration; perform development tests of aircraft, guided missiles and their components to determine their aerodynamic characteristics and to rectify deficiencies; conduct a program of research in mathematical analysis and computer techniques involving the use of high speed automatic computing machinery.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	17	6	1,356	0	0	1,379
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	17	6	1,368	0	0	1,391
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1962	17	6	1,368	0	0	1,391

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	PLANNED	ULTIMATE
	-	-	-

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	186	127,000	20,408,000	20,535,000
2. LEASED	-	-	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		20,535,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				17,707,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				206,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				16,268,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				54,716,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
842	WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	LF	11,380	9,440	0	9,440	206	0	206	206

175

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DAVENDER 3870 (7-58) Supersedes Edition 4080

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 1

(See note on following page.)

A preliminary engineering report was not prepared for this item. The cost estimate was prepared by the station public works officer and reviewed and approved by the area public works officer, Chesapeake.

Final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being prepared by the area public works officer, Chesapeake.

Do you have any statement to make on this project?

Admiral CHEW. The first project is at the David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Md., to construct a water distribution line at a cost of $206,000. The basic mission of the model basin is to conduct fundamental, applied, and developmental research to improve the design of our ships and related equipment and devices. We plan to construct a 20-inch main connecting to the north conduit of the District of Columbia aqueduct system to bring sufficient water to the station to meet operational and fire-protection requirements. The present requirement is for a capacity of about 5,900 gallons of water per minute. The current capacity is only 3,600 gallons per minute, provided through a 14-inch main connected to the south conduit of the District Aqueduct. During the past several years a number of emergency shutdowns occurred in this south conduit which made it necessary for the model basin to shut down equipment for lack of water, thereby delaying the research program and creating a fire hazard through lack of sufficient water and pressure.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is the main line which you are going to tap into available at this time?

Admiral CHEW. Yes, sir; it is.

NAVAL SHIPYARD, CHARLESTON, S.C.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next project is the naval shipyard at Charleston, S.C.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL SHIPYARD	CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA	5867 190
4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	**5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY**	**6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE**	**7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA**
CHARLESTON, 5 MILES SOUTHEAST	CHARLESTON	BUREAU OF SHIPS	6TH NAVAL DISTRICT
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
SHIP AND SUBMARINE REPAIR	1902	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

As a component of the U.S. Naval Base, Charleston, S.C. to provide logistic support for assigned service craft and vessels of the Fleet, including conversion, overhaul, repair, and drydocking of various types of ships of the fleet up to destroyer tenders and including submarines; quinquennial overhauls, including drydocking of Reserve Fleet vessels; research, development and test work, as assigned; support of the Shipyard Commander in his capacity as Industrial Manager, USN, Sixth Naval District; and to provide logistic support to other shore activities of the U.S. Naval Base, Charleston and the Sixth Naval District, as directed.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	76	121	7045	-	234	7476
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	76	121	7045	-	234	7476
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1962	76	121	7045	-	*234	7476

NO. OF AIRCRAFT — PRESENT - — PLANNED - — ULTIMATE -

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *OFFICERS - 80 EM - 154

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	2,102	978,000	61,341,000	62,319,000
2. LEASED	1	(25)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		62,319,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				2,355,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				26,034,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				90,708,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY				AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11	
213	FIRE CONTROL AND NAVIGATION BUILDING	SF	0	25,000	0	25,000	937	0	937	937	22
213	ALTERATIONS OF MISCELLANEOUS BUILDINGS	NA	-	-	-	-	137	0	137	137	23
213	EXTENSION TO MACHINE SHOP	SF	128,500	15,000	0	15,000	369	0	369	369	24
722	MULTI-PURPOSE BUILDING	SF	0	25,000	0	25,000	498	0	498	498	25
801	PIER UTILITIES AND IMPROVEMENTS	NA	-	-	-	-	414	0	414	414	26
								TOTAL	2,355	2,355	

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DD FORM 1390 (7-58) Supersedes Previous Edition

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 2

(See notes on following page.)

237

FIRE CONTROL AND NAVIGATION BUILDING

The preliminary engineering report was prepared by Robert & Co., Associates, Atlanta, Ga., and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and the selection of an architect and engineer is in process.

ALTERATIONS TO MISCELLANEOUS BUILDINGS

The preliminary engineering report was prepared by Robert & Co., Associates, Atlanta, Ga., and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and the selection of an architect and engineer is in process.

EXTENSION TO MACHINE SHOP

The preliminary engineering report was prepared by Robert & Co., Associates, Atlanta, Ga., and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and the selection of an architect and engineer is in process.

MULTIPURPOSE BUILDING

The preliminary engineering report was prepared by Robert & Co., Associates, Atlanta, Ga., and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and the selection of an architect and engineer is in process.

PIER UTILITIES AND IMPROVEMENT

The preliminary engineering report was prepared by Robert & Co., Associates, Atlanta, Ga., and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and the selection of an architect and engineer is in process.

The fee for preliminary engineering for the five items at NSY, Charleston, is $34,302. Prorated cost for individual line items not provided by the field.

Admiral CHEW. The second project consists of five line items for construction of a POLARIS submarine overhaul facility at the Naval Shipyard, Charleston, S.C., at the estimated cost of $2,355,000. The yard's mission is to provide logistic support for assigned conventional and nuclear ships of the fleet and service craft. These ships include destroyers, destroyer tenders, and submarines. Commencing this year, POLARIS submarines will depend on this yard for their upkeep; consequently, complete overhaul facilities must be ready by late 1962.

The first line item is for construction of a fire control and navigation building at the estimated cost of $937,000. This will provide space where the various electrical and electronic components of the fire control and navigation equipment being installed on POLARIS submarines may be housed for test and checkout under controlled environmental conditions and where the special instruments, tools, and spare parts needed for testing and repairing, are available. No facilities now at this shipyard can meet these special requirements; nor are there any which can profitably be converted for this purpose.

The second line item is for alteration of miscellaneous buildings at the estimated cost of $137,000. We have found that, by making certain alterations of three existing structures at the shipyard, we can, in accordance with Navy policy, eliminate the need for constructing additional new buildings. This involves: extension of the clean room facility building to perform a large volume of nuclear repair work,

including inspection, stocking of parts and equipment and performing what is known as clean welding; conversion of the torpedo storage building to a gammagraph facility by addition of 5 feet of earth cover and concrete bulkheads. This facility will be used for testing lead shielding for voids and imperfections. This specially protected facility is required to expose lead slabs to the intense radiation source without harm to the operator. Proper environmental, dust-free conditions must be available to handle a considerable volume of hydraulic equipment repair. The existing hydraulic laboratory building will be converted to serve this purpose.

The third line item is for extension to the machine shop at the estimated cost of $369,000. The machine shop is now so overcrowded, because recent replacements of modern tools and equipment require more space, that temporary outside space, under canvas or in metal sheds, must be used. The recent assignment of a number of active ships, in addition to the POLARIS submarines, precludes the removal of tools now installed and used for the overhaul of conventional ships. The only economical solution to the problem posed by the extra load imposed, is to enlarge the machine shop.

The fourth line item is for construction of a multipurpose building at the estimated cost of $498,000. Due to the limited space aboard submarines, it is necessary, during the overhaul period, to remove all personnel, ship's gear, equipment and supplies. The "multipurpose" of the proposed building is to provide space ashore for normal command and administrative functions, bunk rooms for duty sections, and space for storage, maintenance and repair of ship's equipment.

The fifth line item is for pier utilities and improvements at the estimated cost of $414,000. This is need primarily to provide additional electrical power on pier 317–D where nuclear submarines will be berthed during overhaul. The additional power is required for servicing the submarines as their powerplants will be inactive during this period. Dredging to a new depth of 35 feet is also required to accommodate the deep draft nuclear submarines.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why cannot the requirement for a multipurpose building at the Naval Shipyard, Charleston, S.C., be met by use of existing facilities at this installation, for example, the World War II type barracks and other facilities of this same type?

Admiral CHEW. Well, in answer to your question, sir, due to the limited space aboard submarines it is necessary, during the overhaul period, to remove all personnel, ship's gear, equipment, and supplies. The multipurpose of the proposed building is to provide space ashore for normal command and administrative functions, bunk rooms for duty sections, and space for storage, maintenance, and repair of ship's equipment.

It is a facility where you can move the crew off the submarines during the overhaul period due to the limited space on the submarines, a situation you do not normally have with a larger ship.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What will you do with the World War II type barracks?

Admiral CHEW. We have some of those that are beyond economical repair. They will be demolished.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you have to have this multipurpose building because of the condition the present barracks are in?

Admiral CHEW. That is correct.

Admiral PELTIER. The location is important. These are right near the waterfront.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do we have the assurance of you gentlemen you will get the old barracks out when you have the new building? One of the things I have noticed is that you gentlemen come before us for new buildings to replace old buildings, and when we go look at the new buildings we see that the old buildings are still there.

Admiral CHEW. We can assure you we are conducting at this time a very active program against what we call string savers. We have string savers in the Navy and are doing our best to eliminate them.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions on this item?

Mr. JONAS. No.

NAVAL FACILITY, FORT MILES, DEL.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next we pick up the naval facility at Fort Miles, Del.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL FACILITY	FT. MILES, LEWES, DELAWARE	3060-130

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
SALISBURY, MARYLAND, 38 MILES SOUTHWEST	SUSSEX, DELAWARE	BUREAU OF SHIPS	4TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
OCEANOGRAPHIC RESEARCH	NEW FACILITY	[ ] MAINTENANCE [ ] ACTIVE [ ] INACTIVE [X] NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To conduct oceanographic observations in selected areas in order to provide the U.S. Navy with more extensive information on oceanographic conditions in those areas.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JAN 1960 (CAPE MAY)	11	99	0	0	6	116
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	11	99	0	0	6	116
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1962	11	99	0	0	6	116

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	PLANNED	ULTIMATE
	-	-	-

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *OFF - 1, EM-5

	LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	EXISTING FACILITIES INCLUDING 626 ACRES OF LAND TO BE TRANSFERRED				-
2. LEASED	FROM DEPARTMENT OF ARMY				-
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959			(Except Land Rent)		-
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY					1,293,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST					0
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION					1,293,000
7. GRAND TOTAL					

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)				
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
131	COMMUNICATION FACILITIES	SF	0	1,680	0	1,680	179	0	179	179	53
141	TERMINAL EQUIPMENT BUILDING	SF	0	11,385	0	11,385	380	0	380	380	54
210	MODIFICATION TO MULTI-PURPOSE STRUCTURE	SF	0	23,341	0	23,341	80	0	80	80	55
721	MULTI-PURPOSE BUILDING	SF	0	16,337	0	16,337	282	0	282	282	56
800	UTILITIES AND SERVICES	NA	-	-	-	-	372	0	372	372	57
								TOTAL	1,293	1,293	

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA .

DD FORM 1390 (7-58) Supersedes Revises NAVDOCKS 1390

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 3

341

53884—60—24

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by the district public works officer, 4th Naval District, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being prepared by the district public works officer, 4th Naval District.

TERMINAL EQUIPMENT BUILDING

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by the district public works officer, 4th Naval District, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being prepared by the district public works officer, 4th Naval District.

MODIFICATION TO MULTIPURPOSE STRUCTURE

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by the district public works officer, 4th Naval District, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being prepared by the district public works officer, 4th Naval District.

MULTIPURPOSE BUILDING

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by the district public works officer, 4th Naval District, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being prepared by the district public works officer, 4th Naval District.

UTILITIES AND SERVICES

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by the district public works officer, 4th Naval District, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being prepared by the district public works officer, 4th Naval District.

Admiral CHEW. The third project consists of five line items for construction of an oceanographic facility at the estimated cost of $1,293,000 at the naval facility, Fort Miles, Lewes, Del. By means of these facilities the Navy conducts oceanographic research which is used as an important link in our continental defense. We now have oceanographic research facilities in this area at Cape May, N.J. However, the beach erosion at this site has been so severe as to expose the expensive equipment to destruction by the encroaching seas. Our engineers believe the erosion can be stayed for a few years by the construction of jetties and other protective measures, but only at the prohibitive cost of about $5 million. In accordance with Navy policy, we propose to utilize certain existing facilities on a portion of Fort Miles which the Army has made available to us for the purpose.

The first line item is for construction of communication facilities at the estimated cost of $179,000. No suitable facilities are available at the site which can be used for this purpose. The line item will include antennas, communication lines, and a small transmitter building. Rapid and secure communication is essential if the oceanographic data gathered by the facility is to be effective for fleet operation.

The second line item is also for construction of a new structure. This is for a terminal equipment building at the estimated cost of $380,000. The terminal equipment collects, translates, and displays the oceanographic data for utilization in carrying out the station's mission.

The third line item is for modification of a multipurpose structure at the estimated cost of $80,000. We propose to modify an existing structure to provide space for the normal operations and maintenance functions of a small station, including the public works and automotive equipment shops, supply, Navy exchange, and sickbay functions.

The fourth line item is for construction of a new multipurpose building at the estimated cost of $282,000. There is no existing building on the site which can be made suitable to serve the need. The Navy plans to design this building to include space for barracks, bachelor officers' quarters, messhall and galley, and a small office.

The final line item in this project is for utilities and services at the estimated cost of $372,000. This site is in a remote corner of Fort Miles in which there is now only a small amount of electrical distribution line. This line must be rehabilitated and extended; a new water system must be provided, including wells, elevated tank, and distribution lines; and roads, security fence, and fire alarm must be built to make this a usable facility.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the status of the transfer of Fort Miles, Del., to the Navy from the Army?

Mr. TIENCKEN. We have been in touch with the Army. There is no question but what they will give us the area we want. There is a study going on as to whether we should take more than our actual requirements because the Army wants to give more than we have actually figured we need. We are ironing out that problem but there is no question they will give us what we want.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is a rather rare proposal. I hope you will take advantage of it. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the nature of the facilities existing at Fort Miles at the present time?

Admiral CHEW. At the present time we plan to utilize the Army facilities which were World War II construction, I believe. I am not completely familiar with what the Army has there, but we intend to use whatever they have.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are they in pretty good condition?

Admiral CHEW. I think the parts we want are in pretty good condition.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions on that?

Mr. JONAS. Yes. I do not know if this question is properly propounded to the construction people, but I am interested in this oceanographic facility. We are supporting a pretty broad scale program in that area in the National Science Foundation. What liaison exists between the National Science Foundation people and the Navy on oceanography?

Admiral CHEW. May I go off the record?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. JONAS. That is all.

NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE, NEW LONDON, CONN.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we turn to the Naval Submarine Base at New London, Conn.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE	NEW LONDON, CONNECTICUT	6078600

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
NEW LONDON, 6 MILES SOUTH	NEW LONDON	BUREAU OF SHIPS	3RD NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
SUPPORT ATLANTIC FLEET SUBMARINE FORCES	1868 (1915 AS SUBBASE)	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To maintain and operate small base facilities to support training and experimental operations of Atlantic Fleet Submarine Forces. Provide logistic support for two operational Submarine Squadrons; Headquarters, Commander Submarine Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet; Submarine Development Group Two; Reserve Fleet vessels assigned; and such Operational Development Force vessels as are assigned this area. Provide logistic support and supply department functions for the U.S. Coast Guard and other Naval Activities in the area, as directed by higher authority. Train personnel for duty in the Submarine Forces. Provide relay facilities. Provide for a Registered Publications Issuing Office of the Naval Communications System.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	82	971	850	1,338	8,284	11,525
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	90	1,140	970	1,604	9,612	13,416
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	98	1,250	1,020	*2,219	**10,337	14,924

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	PLANNED	ULTIMATE
	-	-	-

*429 OFF, 1790 EM **1,047 OFF, 9,123 EM, 167 CIV

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	570	759,000	24,241,000	25,000,000
2. LEASED	14	30,000	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		25,000,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				8,123,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				738,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				6,759,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				40,620,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)				
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
165	IMPROVEMENT TO BERTHING PIER	CY	0	170,000	0	170,000	380	0	380	380	28
540	DENTAL CLINIC	SF	2,037 (SUBSTANDARD)	10,400	0	10,400	358	0	358	358	27
812	SECURITY FENCING	LF	187,200	3,000	3,000	0	17	17	0	17	29
								TOTAL	738	755	

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA

DD FORM 1390 (7-58) Superseded Previous edition

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 4

(See note at top of following page.)

IMPROVEMENTS TO BERTHING PIER

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Harbor Engineering & Surveying Co., New York City, for a fee of $5,132, and is complete.
The final plans and specifications have been authorized and the selection of an architect and engineer is in process.

DENTAL CLINIC

The preliminary engineering report is being prepared by Sherwood, Mills, & Smith, Stamford, Conn., for a fee of $2,650.
The final plans and specifications will be authorized upon completion of the preliminary engineering report and after congressional approval of the item.

SECURITY FENCING

A preliminary engineering report for this item was not prepared.
The final plans and specifications have been authorized and will be accomplished by Pedersen and Tilney, New Haven, Conn. Fee not yet determined.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the nature of the lease on the Connecticut State pier at the Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn?

Mr. TIENCKEN. We leased that property from the State of Connecticut at $30,000 a year and the lease extends to June 30, 1963.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where are these craft presently being berthed?

Admiral CHEW. This pier is in use now, sir, and this is for dredging to accommodate the deeper draft submarines that are being constructed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How is the siltation there?

Admiral PELTIER. I do not think it is too bad. It washes out pretty well.

Admiral MOORE. That current is very swift so you do not have much of a problem of silting there, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for a dental clinic at the present time and what will be done with this facility if the new one is constructed?

Admiral CHEW. The dental clinic at the present time is really a dental clinic in name only. Currently only about 50 percent of the personnel can receive proper dental care, treatment for obvious dental conditions which may cause pain within a 6-month period. This is due to the inadequacy of the existing facilities, consisting of only eight dental operating rooms in an old wood building converted from a medical storehouse. It has no room for modern oral surgery or oral prophylaxis.

This item will provide adequate modern facilities to meet the urgent need, including 20 dental operating rooms instead of the present 8.

The important point is, unless it is provided, crews of the nuclear submarines will be sent to sea without dental care and, since cruises are for 6 months or more, many members of the crews will be subject to oral infirmities which could make them unfit to carry out their duties—a critical situation aboard a submarine.

Admiral MOORE. Mr. Chairman, here is an article that appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of November 20, 1958. It talks about the life of nuclear submarine crews being hard on their

teeth, and states that decay of members of nuclear submarine crews is double that of other sailors. So it would seem we will need more dental care for members of crews of nuclear submarines than others.

Admiral CHEW. And the base personnel loading will increase from the present 7,100 to nearly 10,000 in 1963.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions on this item?

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

NAVY UNDERWATER SOUND LABORATORY, NEW LONDON, CONN.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we have the Navy Underwater Sound Laboratory at New London, Conn.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVY UNDERWATER SOUND LABORATORY	NEW LONDON, CONNECTICUT	3865 580
4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	**5. COUNTIES/COUNTY**	**6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE**	**7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA**
WITHIN CITY OF NEW LONDON	NEW LONDON	BUREAU OF SHIPS	3RD NAVAL DISTRICT
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	1945	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

Conduct applied research, development, system studies, and engineering evaluation in the fields of sonar, radio, radar, infra-red, related physical sciences, and other problems as assigned by the Bureau of Ships; provide technical assistance and consultation to the Forces Afloat, Naval Shore Establishments including other Naval laboratories and Government Contractors on problems of mutual concern.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	16	38	675	39	-	768
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	14	36	700	40	-	790
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1962	14	36	700	40*	-	790

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT -	PLANNED -	ULTIMATE -

*OFF - 14 EM - 26

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	105	398,000	6,417,000	6,815,000
2. LEASED	-	(-)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959 (Except Land Rent)				6,815,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				300,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				4,432,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				2,320,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				13,867,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
310	UNDERSEA WARFARE RESEARCH BUILDING	SF	124,661 (SUBSTANDARD)	178,620	0	178,620	4,432	300 (DESIGN ONLY)	4,432	4,432

347

30

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DD FORM 1870 (7-58) Supersedes Previous Edition

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 5

(See note on following page.)

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Douglas Orr, New Haven, Conn., for a fee of $24,613, and is complete.

Final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being accomplished by the same firm for a fee of $176,652.

Admiral CHEW. The fifth project is for construction of an underseas warfare research building at the estimated cost of $4,432,000, at the Navy Underwater Sound Laboratory, New London, Conn. This Navy Laboratory conducts applied research, development, system studies, and engineering evaluation in the fields of sonar, radio, radar, infrared, and related physical sciences; and provides technical assistance and consultation to the forces afloat and to others as needed. The Laboratory is responsible for providing the fleet with advanced sonar detection, undersea communication, and certain missile guidance capabilities in phase with rapid emergence of nuclear power and guided missile warfare. The existing facilities are in 11 scattered, old wood structures, built originally as classrooms, messes, and barracks. They provide only meager and cramped working area; do not permit efficient arrangement of laboratory equipment; and the floors are structurally unable to hold much of the heavy components of equipment being checked and tested. The proposed facility will consolidate the scattered functions, will increase efficiency, and will permit this important research and developmental work to keep pace with the speed of advancement of modern weapons systems and nuclear propulsion.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why have you waited so long to request this facility?

Admiral MOORE. From the point of view of the Bureau of Ships, which is the sponsoring agency, it has always been a question of funds, of the higher priority items taking the place of this one. These buildings are getting into such a state of disrepair it is costing more to repair them than to build new buildings.

Admiral CHEW. Quite frankly, this project has been in our program for, I think, 3 years and in competition with the other items, as Admiral Moore said, it has not made it. Now it has to make it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It would be interesting to see how much you have spent over a period of years to maintain what you have there. I notice you say in your justifications that sizable maintenance savings will accrue, but you do not say how much.

Admiral MOORE. I am sure Mr. Sanders, in his visits, can attest to the poor state of maintenance up there. This, as you know, is our major underwater sound laboratory, and the present facilities are contributing to our ASW problems.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How long do you think it will take to amortize this project?

Admiral MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I have some pictures showing some of the state of disrepair.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions on that?

Mr. JONAS. I believe not.

NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE, PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next, we turn to the Naval Submarine Base at Pearl Harbor.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY | FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM | DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE	PEARL HARBOR, OAHU, HAWAII	6078700

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTY/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
HONOLULU, 6.5 MILES SOUTHEAST	HONOLULU	BUREAU OF SHIPS	14TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
OPERATIONAL & LOGISTIC SUPPORT FOR PACFLT SUBMARINE FORCE	1919	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To maintain and operate facilities to support training and experimental operations of the Pacific Fleet Submarine Force; to provide Logistic Support for two operational Submarine Squadrons, a Guided Missile Activity and Headquarters for Commander, Submarine Force, U. S. Pacific Fleet; to provide repair facilities for other ships as required by Commander-in-Chief, U. S. Pacific Fleet or Commander Service Force, U. S. Pacific Fleet, to provide berthing, messing and other Logistic Support as necessary for the enlisted personnel of the Staffs of CINCPACFLT and COMSERVPAC; to perform such additional tasks as Commander-in-Chief, U. S. Pacific Fleet may assign; to conduct a diving school for Pacific Fleet Personnel.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	24	462	95	350	2,130	3,061
2. PLANNED - END FY 1960	24	462	95	350	2,130	3,061
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1960	24	462	95	350 *	2,130**	3,061

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	PLANNED	ULTIMATE
	-	-	-

*OFF - 35 EM - 315 **OFF - 213 EM - 1917

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	85	36,000	10,710,000	10,746,000
2. LEASED	-	(-)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		10,746,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				144,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				509,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				12,426,000
			7. GRAND TOTAL	23,825,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	9	6	10	8	7	8	9	10	11
171	SUBMARINE ATTACK TRAINING BUILDING	SF	11,170 (3,857 SUBSTANDARD)	18,180	0	18,180	509	0	509	509

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 6

(See note on following page.)

350

31

The preliminary engineering report was prepared by Law and Wilson, Honolulu, Hawaii, for a fee of $8,424, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and the selection of an architect and engineer is in process.

Do you have any comments to make with regard to this project? Give us an explanation of that requirement.

Admiral CHEW. This item is for the construction of a Submarine Attack Training Building at the estimated cost of $509,000. The mission of this base is similar to that of our Continental Sub Base at New London. It is the headquarters of the submarine force, Pacific Fleet; provides facilities for maintenance and operation of training and experimental functions of the Pacific Fleet Submarine Force; and provides logistic support for two operational submarine squadrons and a guided missile activity. The existing trainer building was built near the start of World War II to train crews in operation of fleet submarines then in use. The equipment is obsolete and the building is too small for present day equipment and cannot be enlarged due to the proximity of other structures. The new attack trainer equipment must be adequately housed for training crews in diving tactics, fire control and antisubmarine warfare for the modern, conventional and nuclear-type submarines in order to develop maximum combat readiness.

In other words, this is a replacement of an existing facility which we could not expand.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What would be a substitute for it?

Admiral CHEW. The present structure, which was designed for World War II submarines.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What will be done with it if the new building is constructed?

Admiral CHEW. It will continue in use.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions on that?

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

NAVAL SHIPYARD, PORTSMOUTH, N.H.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next is the Naval Shipyard at Portsmouth, N.H.

(See note on following page.)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL SHIPYARD	PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE	5867650

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE - 1 MILE SOUTHWEST	YORK	BUREAU OF SHIPS	1ST NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
SUBMARINE CONSTRUCTION, DESIGN AND OVERHAUL	1800	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

Provide logistic support for assigned service craft and for Active Fleet vessels, including conversion, overhaul, alteration, and dry docking of submarines and various types of surface ships up to and including submarine tenders; design and construction of submarines; design, construction, and overhaul of nuclear type submarines; quinquennial overhauls, including dry docking of Reserve Fleet Vessels; to provide base facilities for servicing nuclear powered submarines, research, development, and test work, as assigned; responsibility for the administration of the U. S. Navy Housing Project, Kittery, Maine; and to provide logistic support to other activities of the U. S. Naval Base, Portsmouth, and the First Naval District as directed.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	71	85	8,381	0	-	8,537
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	73	85	8,400	0	-	8,558
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1962	73	85	7,800	0	-	7,958

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	-	PLANNED	-	ULTIMATE	-

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

	LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED		286	1,095,000	38,353,000	39,448,000
2. LEASED		-	(300)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959			(Except Lond Rent)		39,448,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY					3,497,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST					6,829,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION					5,886,000
7. GRAND TOTAL					55,660,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)				
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
165	DEEPENING OF BERTHS	CY	-	94,188	61,688	32,500	1,192	497	695	695	33
213	RECONSTRUCTION OF DRY DOCK	SF	190,186 (32,040 SUBSTANDARD)	32,040	0	32,040	5,994	0	5,994	5,994	34
812	ADDITION TO ELECTRIC DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	EA	-	-	-	-	140	0	140	140	32
								TOTAL	6,829	6,829	

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DD FORM 1390 (7-58) Previous Editions Obsolete

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 7

(See note at top of following page.)

350b

DEEPENING OF BERTHS

The preliminary engineering report was prepared by Fay, Spofford and Thorndike, Boston, Mass., for a fee of $17,802, and is complete.
The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being prepared by the same firm for a fee of $21,317.

RECONSTRUCTION OF DRYDOCK

The preliminary engineering report was prepared by Fay, Spofford, and Thorndike, Boston, Mass., for a fee of $17,802, and is complete.
The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being prepared by the same firm for a fee of $171,894.

ADDITION TO ELECTRIC DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM

The preliminary engineering report was prepared by the Public Works Officer, Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, and is complete.
The final plans and specifications have been authorized and the selection of an architect and engineer is in process.

Admiral CHEW. The seventh project, at the Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, N.H., consists of three line items in the total amount of $6,829,000. The mission of this shipyard is oriented principally to the design, construction, overhaul, and repair of modern submarines. A major problem of this yard, as at other large segments of our Shore Establishment, is the need for modernization.

The first line item is for deepening of berths at the estimated cost of $695,000. This work will consist of dredging, including a considerable amount of rock excavation, at two berths to the depth of 35 feet required for the deep-draft modern submarines. These berths will be needed in 1961 for the overhaul, repair, and refueling of submarines of the POLARIS type. A similar line item was authorized last year to accommodate two submarines now being constructed, which are scheduled for coming off the ways this year.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What type of work do you anticipate for the drydock which you are reconstructing at the Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, N.H., with these funds?

Admiral CHEW. The reconstruction of the drydocks is, again, required because of technological progress. A fully loaded nuclear submarine of the newest class has a maximum draft of ——— feet. The three existing drydocks at this shipyard are too small to handle these modern submarines. Two of these docks have full usage by normal workload operations. We propose to reconstruct the third dock by deepening it from 17.3 to 37 feet below mean high water; lengthening it from 375 to 480 feet; providing new caisson gate and pumping station, and electrical services to the dock; extending the crane and railroad tracks; and dredging the approach channel to allow passage and entrance into the dock of nuclear-powered submarines under emergency conditions. This will then become the only naval shipyard on the east coast north of Charleston with adequate submarine repair capabilities for all classes of our submarines.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I presume there is no place to do this work in private industry on a comparable basis? Has that been surveyed?

Admiral CHEW. It has been surveyed and it would be impractical because of the know-how known at the yard for this type of repair.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the nature of the dredging here at a cost in excess of $16 a cubic yard?

(See note at top of following page.)

Admiral CHEW. Does this have to do with the dredging?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Admiral MOORE. I just came from that shipyard. We ran into a good deal of granite and as we dredge we will get into some hard ledge.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, the excessive cost factor is because you are getting into hard rock?

Admiral MOORE. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What naval submarine repair facilities exist on the east coast, and what is their capacity?

Admiral MOORE. I would like to speak to that, sir. Portsmouth is the only Government shipyard we have on the entire east coast that builds submarines and also repairs submarines. We do some limited repair work at Philadelphia on some types of submarines and we do some at Charleston, but right now we have only one Government shipyard that can repair nuclear submarines. Right now Portsmouth is the one yard that has the capability of overhauling nuclear submarines, including the POLARIS submarines.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then the private yards are not available?

Admiral MOORE. There is only one drydock at Portsmouth that can handle the draft of the submarines we are talking about, and even that is marginal.

NAVAL SHIPYARD, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Now, we shall take up the Naval Shipyard at San Francisco.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM
SECTION 1: INSTALLATION DATA
DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL SHIPYARD	SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA	5867725

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
WITHIN CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO	SAN FRANCISCO	BUREAU OF SHIPS	12TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PROJECT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
SHIP BUILDING, REPAIRS, OVERHAUL AND CONVERSION	1941	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To provide logistic support for assigned ships and service craft; to perform authorized work in connection with construction, conversion, overhaul, repair, alteration, dry-docking, and outfitting of ships and crafts as assigned; to perform research, development, and test work, as assigned; to provide services and material to other activities and units, as directed by competent authority.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	86	80	7,350	827	6,383	14,726
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	86	80	7,350	909	7,021	15,446
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1962	86	80	7,350	909*	7,021**	15,446

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT -	PLANNED -	ULTIMATE -

*OFF - 34, EM - 875 **OFF - 1,405, EM - 5,616

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	972	4,686,000	91,222,000	95,908,000
2. LEASED	-	(-)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Excepts Land Rent)		95,908,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				350,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				285,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				19,857,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				116,400,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY				AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
812	ADDITION TO ELECTRIC DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	LF	504,000	12,800	0	12,800	285	0	285	285

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DAVENPORT DEPO (7-58) Supercedes Previous edition

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 8

The preliminary engineering report was prepared by the public works officer, San Francisco Naval Shipyard, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and will be prepared by the district public works officer, 12th Naval District.

Admiral CHEW. The final project in this class for a naval shipyard inside the United States, is at San Francisco, Calif., for an addition to electric distribution system at the estimated cost of $285,000. The mission of this shipyard is to provide logistic support for various ships and service craft and to perform work for construction, conversion, overhaul, repair, alteration, drydocking, and outfifitting of assigned ships and crafts. The modern aircraft carrier *Ranger* is home ported at San Francisco. Other large carriers also require servicing at this port from time to time. Ships undergoing servicing secure their boilers and become dependent on the shipyard utility systems for "hotel" load. This load comprises that portion of permanently installed equipment aboard the ship that must be maintained in operation for the crew remaining aboard. There is not sufficient 480-volt power for the hotel load and at the same time for production load demands. The KVA is available at drydock No. 4 and 2,000 KVA at the north pier. The 6,800 KVA is required at each location. The addition of 5,000 KVA through the proposed project will remedy this situation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I happen to know about this item, the Naval Shipyard at San Francisco, so I have no questions on it.

Any questions?

Mr. JONAS. I do not think I care to ask any questions on that.

NAVAL FACILITY, BERMUDA

Now tell us about the Naval Facility at Bermuda.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
FY 1960 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM
SECTION 1: INSTALLATION DATA
17 FEBRUARY 1960

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY | FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM | DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL FACILITY	TUDOR HILL (STONE HILL), BERMUDA	6030120A
4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
HAMILTON, BERMUDA, ADJACENT TO CITY	BERMUDA	BUREAU OF SHIPS	ATLANTIC OCEAN AREA
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS: ☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW
OCEANOGRAPHIC STUDY	1953	

SECTION II. MISSION

Conduct oceanographic observations in selected areas in order to provide the U. S. Navy with more extensive information on oceanographic conditions in those areas.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	12	109	0	0	0	121
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	12	109	0	0	0	121
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1961	12	109	0	0	0	121

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	PLANNED	ULTIMATE
	-	-	-

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	-	-	-	0
2. LEASED	983	(-)	650	650
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		650
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				908,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				0
7. GRAND TOTAL				908,650

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY				AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
141	REPLACEMENT OF TEMPORARY BUILDINGS AND ENLARGEMENT	SF	13,837 (SUBSTANDARD)	25,838	0	25,838	908	0	908	908

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DD FORM 1390 (7-58) Supersedes Previous Edition

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 9

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by area public works officer, Atlantic Division, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and the selection of an architect and engineer is in process.

96

Mr. SHEPPARD. Could you give us a brief description of this item?

Admiral CHEW. The project at the Naval Facility, Bermuda, is for replacement and enlargement of temporary buildings at an estimated cost of $908,000. She existing buildings are quonset huts which are too small to house satisfactorily the two sets of terminal equipment now being used; a third additional set which is required; and other associated equipment. Also, the huts have deteriorated to the point where the very valuable equipment is in danger of serious damage by wind, dust, and rain. The new terminal equipment building will provide adequate space for the equipment together with the temperature and humidity control necessary for its proper operation. In addition a second small new building will replace three quonset hut generator buildings, a quonset hut recreation and training building and a quonset hut administration building. This is a straight replacement and an expansion to take care of the additional equipment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions on this item?

Mr. JONAS. No, sir.

NAVAL FACILITY, PUERTO RICO

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have one line item here for the Naval Facility at the Ramey Air Force Base, P.R.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL FACILITY	RAMEY AIR FORCE BASE, PUERTO RICO	3060600
4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. Over 10,000) Distance & Direction	**5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY**	**6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE**	**7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA**
AQUADILLA, PUERTO RICO, 5 MILES SOUTHWEST	AQUADILLA DISTRICT, PUERTO RICO	BUREAU OF SHIPS	10TH NAVAL DISTRICT
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
OCEANOGRAPHIC STUDY	1954	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

Conducts oceanographic observations in selected areas in order to provide the U. S. Navy with more extensive information on oceanographic conditions in those areas.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	8	69	3	0	0	80
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	8	69	3	0	0	80
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1961	8	69	3	0	0	80

NO. OF AIRCRAFT — PRESENT – — PLANNED – — ULTIMATE –

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	3.5	875	94,000	94,000
2. LEASED	–	(–)	–	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Cost)		94,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				200,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				435,000
			7. GRAND TOTAL	729,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
1. NAVY CODE	2. LINE ITEM TITLE	3. UNIT	4. INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	5. ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	6. PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	7. NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	8. ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	9. PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	10. NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	11. NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED FY
141	TERMINAL EQUIPMENT BUILDING	SF	5,750 (SUBSTANDARD)	7,483	0	7,483	200	0	200	200

123

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DD FORM 1390 (7-58) Superseded Previous Edition

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 10

(See note at top of following page.)

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by area public works officer, Caribbean, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications will be authorized upon completion of review of the preliminary engineering report and will be prepared by the area public works officer, Caribbean.

How far is this facility located from the Air Force base and what facilities are present which could be converted to this type of work, if any?

Admiral CHEW. This is for construction of a terminal equipment building similar to the one above. In other words, the present housing is completely inadequate. We have the equipment in place. This is purely to put a roof over it, as it were; the same, or almost precisely the same reason as the preceding project.

The existing quonset hut houses only one set of terminal equipment. This hut has also deteriorated so much that the damage to the equipment can only be prevented by construction of a new structure. Here, again, I think we have reached the point of diminishing returns in trying to repair the quonsets.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have been under the impression that this base had been previously fenced. I see the inclusion of a fence in here. Was your fence torn down? It was my first impression the security fencing was completed. What is the story on that briefly? It will only be a minor contribution toward the cost factor anyway. What has happened there?

Admiral PELTIER. The one side is relocated.

Admiral CHEW. It is a relocation of the fence.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, the fence is here. This is a relocation.

Admiral PELTIER. The building had to be enlarged. The fence was too close.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on the item?

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

FLEET BASE FACILITIES

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is "Fleet Base Facilities." Insert in the record the summary sheets on fleet base facilities.

Admiral CHEW. The second facilities class in the program is "Fleet Base Facilities." It includes eight line items for $7,177,000 at seven stations, all but one of which is in the United States. Four of these stations provide direct logistic support to the active fleet; two support astronomical research and time service functions of the Naval Observatory, and the remaining activity is an oversea military mission. The total amount for the six U.S. projects is $6,502,000. The single oversea project for $675,000, will provide family housing for a U.S. military mission. All of these line items are unclassified and all but one are included in the fiscal year 1961 authorization bill.

(The matter referred to follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT ON CLASS 2 PUBLIC WORKS CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEAR 1961

FLEET FACILITIES

Fleet facilities are sponsored by the Assistant Vice Chief of Naval Operations and Director of Naval Administration. These facilities are located at naval stations, bases, and districts not under the management control of a technical bureau or office.

In the fiscal year 1961 program authorization is being requested to provide facilities as follows:

Charleston, S.C.: Water distribution at fleet piers	$56,000
Washington, D.C.: Time service and astrophysics building	250,000
U.S. Naval Observatory, Flagstaff Station, Flagstaff, Ariz.: Astrometric telescope facility	1,900,000
Mayport, Fla.:	
Utilities and services	1,225,000
Destroyer pier utilities and improvements	670,000
Treasure Island, San Francisco, Calif: Sewage disposal facilities	701,000
San Diego, Calif.: Nuclear submarine pier	1,700,000
Golcuk, Turkey: Family housing	675,000
Total	7,177,000

These items are military necessities. The item for water distribution at Charleston is to provide potable water to operating destroyers and submarines; the item for a time service and astrophysics building at the Naval Observatory, Washington, D.C., is to provide for more precise time and frequency values; the item for an astrometric telescope facility at Flagstaff is to provide more precise positional astronomy information in support of navigational, satellite, geodetic, and space programs; the item for utilities and services at Mayport is to serve the expanded fleet support facilities at this station, and the item for destroyer pier utilities and improvements at Mayport is for support of the fleet units homeported at this excellent operating base; the item for sewage disposal at Treasure Island, San Francisco, is to eliminate pollution in order to conform to sanitary standards of the California Regional Water Pollution Control Board; the item for a nuclear submarine pier at San Diego is to provide safe berthing for these valuable ships in the outer harbor; the item for family housing at Golcuk, Turkey, is to provide family accommodations for the U.S. naval officers and enlisted men, and their families, who are assigned for duty.

NAVAL STATION, CHARLESTON, S.C.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The first item reflected thereunder is the Naval Station, Charleston, S.C. That is reflected on page 11 of the justifications.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL STATION	CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA	6029-205

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
CHARLESTON, 5 MILES SOUTHEAST	CHARLESTON AND BERKELEY	CNO-ADMINISTRATION	6TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
LOGISTIC SUPPORT FOR OPERATING FORCES	1959	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To provide, as appropriate, logistic support for the operating forces of the Navy, and for dependent activities and other commands as assigned.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	53	408	234	0	5,550	6,245
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	53	408	234	0	12,200*	12,903
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	53	408	234	0	12,208*	12,903

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	PLANNED	ULTIMATE
	-	-	-

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *991 OFF - 11,217 EM

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	143.4	92,000	8,481,000	8,573,000
2. LEASED	-	(-)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		8,573,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				56,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				16,475,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				25,104,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION			PHYSICAL CAPACITY				AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11
711	FAMILY HOUSING - CAPEHART	FA	1,381	3,861	0	500	-	-	-	-
842	ENLARGEMENT OF WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	LF	800 (SUBSTANDARD)	1,230	0	1,230	56	0	56	56

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DD FORM 1390 (7-58) Supersedes Previous Edition

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 11

(See note at top of following page.)

358

58

The preliminary engineering report was prepared by the district public works officer, 6th Naval District, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and will be prepared by the district public works officer, 6th Naval District.

Admiral CHEW. The first project is at the Naval Station, Charleston, S.C. It will provide for the enlargement of the water distribution system at the estimated cost of $56,000. The station is responsible for furnishing logistic support to the operating forces and other naval commands. Starting this spring, destroyers, submarines, and associated ships will be homeported at this station where they will be berthed at piers 5 and 6 for necessary servicing. Constructed in 1947 for berthing inactive ships of the Atlantic Reserve Fleet, these piers lack piping and connections to furnish sufficient fresh water to active fleet ships. To correct this deficiency, we propose to construct a new 6-inch water main on pier 6, extend the existing 6-inch water main on pier 5, and install water connections and backflow prevention units at the ship berths on each pier.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice a constant increase in the deployment of vessels to the Charleston area. You now have Minecraft, POLARIS-type submarines and these additional destroyers and submarines mentioned here quartered in this rather compact area. Isn't this something in contrast to your so-called dispersal policy?

Admiral CHEW. No, sir. This was a relocation, or it is almost a part of the dispersal policy since previously destroyers were not homeported at Charleston. These are actually pulled from either Norfolk or Newport in an attempt to disperse.

Admiral PELTIER. This is a replacement of existing facilities.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In this enlargement program, which I understand is replacement generally, how much more are you going to put on top, operationally speaking, of what you presently have there?

Admiral CHEW. Historically, Mr. Chairman, perhaps you remember we used to have Minecraft primarily placed at Charleston. Now we have dispersed, if we can use that term, two destroyers, two destroyer squadrons and their tender, plus the load of the submarines, which Admiral Moore spoke of at the Charleston Shipyard.

We have that facility there now taking care of minecraft, destroyers, and the additional submarines.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions?

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

NAVAL OBSERVATORY, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, gentlemen, we will pick up the next item, Naval Observatory, District of Columbia.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL OBSERVATORY	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	4470-500

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTY/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
WITHIN CITY OF WASHINGTON, D. C.	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	CNO-ADMINISTRATION	POTOMAC RIVER NAVAL COMMAND

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
ASTRONOMICAL DATA AND TIME, ASTRONOMICAL RESEARCH	1893	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To make such observations of celestial bodies, natural and artificial, derive and publish such data as will afford to United States Naval vessels and aircraft as well as to all availing themselves thereof, means for safe navigation, including the provision of accurate time; and while pursuing this primary function, contribute material to the general advancement of navigation and astronomy.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	4	0	115	0	0	119
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	4	0	125	0	0	129
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	4	0	125	0	0	129

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	PLANNED	ULTIMATE
	-	-	-

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	72	216,000	1,429,000	1,645,000
2. LEASED	-	-	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Cost)		1,645,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				250,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				0
7. GRAND TOTAL				1,895,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
310	TIME SERVICE AND ASTROPHYSICS BUILDING	SF	1,500	9,355	0	9,355	250	0	250	250

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA

DAYBOOKER 2870 (7-58) Independent Loadmaster 4080

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 12

(See notes on following page.)

360

42

The preliminary engineering report was prepared by H. D. Nottingham & Associates, Arlington, Va., for a fee of $4,125, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being prepared by the same firm for a fee of $9,248.

Admiral CHEW. The next project is at the Naval Observatory in the District of Columbia for construction of an extension to the Time Service and Astrophysics Building at the estimated cost of $250,000. The Observatory makes observations of natural and artificial celestial bodies; derives and publishes data for use in safe navigation; is the sole U.S. source of accurate time; and contributes measurably to the advancement of the sciences of navigation and astronomy. The proposed building extension will provide additional space in which our atomic clocks will be housed and additional library space. These demands stem from the military services, NASA, and their contractors as a result of recent advances in weapons systems, space technology, and scientific research. The ultimate accuracy of advanced navigational, missile, and satellite system is limited by the accuracy with which the Naval Observatory can determine and supply time. The VLF control equipment, recording instruments, crystal clocks, atomic standards and associated apparatus, now scattered throughout the Observatory and at other sites, must be assembled in one building to assure the maximum accuracy in providing this worldwide time and frequency service.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You show one line item here. What type building will this be, including the exterior finish, gentlemen?

Admiral PELTIER. The exterior finish will match the existing building. It will be masonry construction. This is limestone facing, matching the limestone exterior of the existing structure.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the difference in cost of going into the limestone structure in order to conform with the localized architecture as against the modern concept of building?

Admiral PELTIER. It will cost us a little more for limestone facing but not too much. Normally we would probably use brick in lieu of limestone.

Mr. SHEPPARD. About 28 percent?

Admiral PELTIER. Not that much. I do not have that information avaiable here. We have made some studies on some of this.

NOTE.—Limestone facing costs $15,000 more than brick.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where are you bringing the limestone from?

Admiral PELTIER. I do not know where this would come from. I am sure we have some within a hundred miles.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you have to haul for a hundred miles as against the amount of construction and shaping your blocks, which I assume will have to be done—I do not recall, but I think you are going to find that that will up your price. If you say "No," I will take your word for it.

Admiral PELTIER. For our building, it is $20 a square foot. That is not very expensive. For this type lab building, it is not too expensive, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions?

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

NAVAL OBSERVATORY, FLAGSTAFF, ARIZ.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Naval Observatory, Flagstaff, Ariz.

(See notes on following page.)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY | FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM | DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL OBSERVATORY,	FLAGSTAFF, ARIZONA	44723 50

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
FLAGSTAFF, 5 MILES NORTHEAST	COCONINO	CNO-ADMINISTRATION	11TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
ASTRONOMICAL DATA- ASTRONOMICAL RESEARCH	1955	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To obtain on a permanent basis such astrometric and astrophysical observations as are necessary to the fulfillment of the mission of the Naval Observatory, and, while pursuing this primary function, to contribute material to the general advancement of astronomy.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	0	0	3	-	-	3
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	0	0	5	-	-	5
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	0	0	8	-	-	8

NO. OF AIRCRAFT - | PRESENT - | PLANNED - | ULTIMATE -

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	160	23,000	139,000	162,000
2. LEASED	0	(-)	30,000	30,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except land cost)		192,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				1,900,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				0
7. GRAND TOTAL				2,092,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
310	ASTROMETRIC TELESCOPE FACILITY	SF	3,204	13,290	0	13,290	1,900	0	1,900	1,900

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DAVDOCKS 2870 (7-58) Supersedes Previous Edition

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 13

(See note on following page.)

362

41

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Charles W. Jones, Los Angeles, Calif., for a fee of $26,176, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and will be prepared by the same firm. Fee not yet determined.

Admiral CHEW. The third project is at the Naval Observatory, Flagstaff, Ariz. This is for construction of an astrometric telescope at the estimated cost of $1,900,000. This observatory is responsible for determining the precise positions of celestial bodies, natural and artificial. However, present instrumentation is inadequate for modern demands. The worldwide need for optical instrumentation with the capability of determining precise positions of very faint celestial bodies, has increased with the advent of artificial satellite and space programs. Progress of research necessary for more precise astronomical data to meet the increasing requirement of military and scientific programs has been seriously retarded by the limitations of astrometric telescopes. A recent breakthrough in telescope design now permits greatly accelerated research. The advantages of the proposed 60-inch reflector are a gain in 11 orders of magnitude in brightness over present optical tracking means and a gain of accuracy of 3,600 over radio tracking techniques. Insofar as our scientists can determine, no instrument with the capability of the one proposed exists anywhere in the world at this time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the status of the plans for the telescope and associated equipment here?

Admiral CHEW. Dr. Clements, I think, can tell you.

Dr. CLEMENTS. I am the Scientific Director of the Naval Observatory. We are planning to put this 60-inch telescope in Flagstaff. The engineering study is now in progress and if the money is appropriated this year, we hope to let contracts for all of the construction before the end of the summer.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice in your breakdown that you do not indicate you are carrying any additional power factors. Are there no additional power requirements due to this expanded operation?

Dr. CLEMENTS. No, sir. There will be no additional power requirements. We already have electric power in there for the telescope that we have already and we will just use that facility that we have there.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are working on a one-line delivery with your public utility. You do not have a loop system?

Dr. CLEMENTS. I do not believe so.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the schedule for continuity of operation? Are you supposed to be a 24-hour operation or not?

Dr. CLEMENTS. At Flagstaff we work only at night and only sufficient time in the daytime to take care of the observations that we make at night.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How many times in the past 2 years, if you know, have you shut down because of power failures in that area, if any?

Dr. CLEMENTS. To my knowledge we have not been shut down in the past 2 years for more than a couple of nights.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it considered necessary to have any new breakthroughs in the state of the art to construct this advance equipment?

Dr. CLEMENTS. No, sir. The necessary breakthroughs were all made several years ago.

(See note on following page.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on the item?

Mr. JONAS. We are just beginning this at Flagstaff, aren't we?

Dr. CLEMENTS. This telescope, sir, we are just beginning to plan for. We have had out there for several years a smaller telescope, the 40-inch telescope.

Mr. JONAS. This $1.9 million will complete the work in plan so far up to this point?

Dr. CLEMENTS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. How many similar facilities are we building in the Government?

Dr. CLEMENTS. We are not building any other optical telescopes in the Space Administration.

We are building some radio telescopes.

Mr. JONAS. The space people are not building optical telescopes?

Dr. CLEMENTS. No, sir.

Mr. JONAS. What is at Green Bank?

Dr. CLEMENTS. At Green Bank, W. Va., is already the National Radio Astronomy Observatory with some radio telescopes.

Mr. JONAS. No optical equipment there?

Dr. CLEMENTS. No, sir.

Mr. JONAS. How does the 60-inch scope compare in size with the other telescopes in the observatories around the world? Is that considered a big one or a medium-sized one or a small one?

Dr. CLEMENTS. In size it will be moderate. There are five or six larger in this country and many smaller, but it has a couple of unique features not found in any other existing telescope.

Mr. JONAS. Why would we build one smaller than maximum?

Dr. CLEMENTS. Because we require an unusual amount of rigidity in this one and if we try to make the mirror too large we cannot obtain the necessary rigidity.

Mr. JONAS. How do the people who operate the larger scopes maintain the necessary rigidity?

Dr. CLEMENTS. They require less than we do, sir.

They are interested primarily in collecting light and with this telescope we shall be measuring where the light comes from, the position in the sky that it comes from.

Mr. JONAS. Is this information you are seeking not available from any other observatories in the United States?

Dr. CLEMENTS. No, sir.

There is no other telescope in the world that is capable of providing this information.

Mr. JONAS. You mean it will be the only one in the world so far as you know?

Dr. CLEMENTS. Of this particular type.

Mr. JONAS. What is so unique about this one that makes it important to bring it into being at this time?

Dr. CLEMENTS. This telescope, sir, has two unique features, or will have. In the first place, the mounting is especially rigid so that there is no distortion in the light ray as it comes in from outside space and gets registered to the photographic plate. In the second place, the mirrors will be made of quartz instead of glass, as all existing telescopes are, and that will give it much greater precision so that we shall be able to observe and measure the distances of the closest stars

to us which are too faint to be observed at all with our existing equipment.

Admiral CHEW. I think, Mr. Jonas, I can amplify this from the layman's point of view because I also was interested in this. I found that this particular type telescope is for measurement in the field of navigation and astronomy whereas the average telescope, the normal telescope for observation, is not used for the precise measurements required for this type of work.

Mr. JONAS. We have got a billion dollar budget for the Space Administration—$914 million. If there is any agency in the Government interested in space and what is out in the unknown, I should think it would be the Space Administration. I am questioning whether the Navy needs to build another installation of this type. I can hardly conceive of the Space Administration, getting underway as they are, without finding a need for this same sort of facility now that they have enough money to build it.

Admiral CHEW. First of all, and I do not speak of tradition as hampering us, a traditional role of the Navy is navigation; we have the unique capability in this. NASA and the Space Administration, I am sure, will use the results of your determinations at Flagstaff.

Dr. CLEMENTS. Yes, sir.

If I may put it in a slightly different way——

Mr. JONAS. Can you give me or the committee assurances that NASA is not duplicating this facility or has not already provided for its duplication?

Dr. CLEMENTS. Yes, sir. I am positive of it. I am in close touch with the NASA officials and in fact, I serve on several advisory committees to them.

Mr. JONAS. That is all.

NAVAL STATION, MAYPORT, FLA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall take up the next item, naval station, at Mayport, Fla.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL STATION	MAYPORT, FLORIDA	1459545

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTY/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
JACKSONVILLE, 20 MILES WEST	DUVAL	CNO-ADMINISTRATION	6TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
LOGISTIC SUPPORT TO CARRIERS AND DESTROYERS	1942	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To provide, as appropriate, logistic support for the operating forces of the Navy, and for dependent activities and other commands as assigned. In addition, an air department will be operated.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	23	341	170	-	10,899	11,433
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	24	341	170	-	16,071*	16,606
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	23	341	170	-	16,071*	16,605

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	PLANNED	ULTIMATE
	-	-	-

SECTION IV. INVENTORY @ OFF - 853 EM - 15,218

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	2,545	397,000	10,328,000	10,725,000
2. LEASED	-	(-)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Cost)		10,725,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				10,525,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				1,895,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				16,043,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				39,188,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)				
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JUL 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11	
154	DESTROYER BERTHING UTILITIES AND IMPROVEMENTS	MA	-	-	-	-	670	0	670	670	60
711	FAMILY HOUSING - CAPEHART	FA	400	4,933	40	500	-	-	-	-	
801	UTILITIES AND SERVICES	MA	-	-	-	-	1,225	0	1,225	1,225	61
								TOTAL	1,895	1,895	

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DD FORM 1870 (7-58) Supersedes Previous Issue

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 14

(See note on following page.)

DESTROYER BERTHING UTILITIES AND IMPROVEMENTS

The preliminary engineering report was prepared by Reynolds, Smith & Hills, Jacksonville, Fla., for a fee of $6,944, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and the selection of an architect and engineer is in process.

UTILITIES AND SERVICES

The preliminary engineering report is being prepared by Smith & Gillespie, Jacksonville, Fla., for a fee of $28,390.

The final plans and specifications will be authorized upon completion of preliminary engineering report.

Admiral CHEW. The fourth project in this group is at the Naval Station, Mayport, Fla., and consists of two line items in the amount of $1,895,000. This station is responsible for providing logistic support to the carriers and destroyers home ported at Mayport; to the naval air activities operating from this station; and to other assigned activities.

The first line item is for destroyer pier utilities and improvements at the estimated cost of $670,000. This station is responsible for logistic support of 24 destroyers and a destroyer tender. Utilities should be provided for 16 destroyers simultaneously. There is existing berthing space, with utilities, except steam, for 12 destroyers. A 550-foot-long bulkhead is available along the south side of the turning basin. This can be used for berthing and remaining four destroyers and tender by providing utilities, cleats, fender system, and increased depth by dredging from the existing 15 feet to 30 feet. The proposed line item will provide the needed facilities by extension of the existing utilities from the present destroyers berths to the south side bulkhead. It will also provide for construction of a small heating plant to satisfy the requirement for steam at both berthing spaces.

The second line item is for utilities and services at the estimated cost of $1,225,000. Until a few years ago this was a small auxiliary air station to the master jet station at Cecil Field and was used principally for field carrier landing practice. Consequently, to meet the small demand of this airfield, the utilities systems were built with relatively small capacities. Now, the station must support logistically the 3 carriers, 24 destroyers, and a destroyer tender which are home ported here. In addition to requirements of these ships, additional facilities to support them have been constructed, thus adding to the demand on the small capacity of the existing utilities. As a result of an engineering study, it has been determined that the most efficient and economical way to meet the station's utilities requirements is to build single integrated utilities systems. This line item will satisfy this need by replacing, and in some cases extending, the existing limited electric, water, sewer, and road systems.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where are the 24 destroyers and destroyer tenders set forth in this justification being supported at the present time, gentlemen?

Admiral CHEW. We are moving the destroyers in there now and those destroyers, as I mentioned before, were coming from Newport and Norfolk.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions upon this item?

(See note on following page.)

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA

Mr. JONAS. Is this part of the dispersal program, too?

Admiral CHEW. Yes, sir, it is.

Mr. JONAS. What are you going to leave at Newport?

Admiral CHEW. We have plenty of destroyers at Newport, sir. I might add, Mr. Jonas, that in addition to dispersal, this has a very fine operating area for our carriers and their attendant screening destroyers.

Mr. JONAS. That is all.

NAVAL STATION, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next project is the Naval Station at San Diego, Calif.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL STATION	SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA	6029 699
4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	**5. COUNTY/COUNTRY**	**6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE**	**7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA**
SAN DIEGO, 1/2 MILE SOUTHEAST	SAN DIEGO	CNO-ADMINISTRATION	11TH NAVAL DISTRICT
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PROJECT	**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
LOGISTIC SUPPORT TO FLEET AND OTHER ACTIVITIES	1922	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To provide, as appropriate, logistic support for the operating forces of the Navy, and for dependent activities and other commands as assigned.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	58	379	1956	2,300	36,090	40,783
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	52	379	1956	2,300	35,878	40,565
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	52	379	1956	*2,300	*35,878	40,565

NO. OF AIRCRAFT — PRESENT -- PLANNED -- ULTIMATE --

*OFF - 90, EM - 2,210

SECTION IV. INVENTORY OFF - 2,680, EM 33,198

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	1,817	9,076,000	54,857,000	63,933,000
2. LEASED	29	(2)	3,312,000	3,312,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except land cost)		67,245,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				1,700,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				12,525,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				81,470,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (IN Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
151	NUCLEAR SUBMARINE PIER	FB	22,227	1,135	0	1,135	1,700	0	1,700	1,700

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DD FORM 1390 (7-62) Supersedes Previous Edition

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 15

(See note on following page.)

53984—60—26

369

62

The preliminary engineering report was prepared by Porter, Urquhart, McCreary & O'Brien, Los Angeles, Calif., for a fee of $38,830, and is complete.
The final plans and specifications have been authorized and the selection of an architect and engineer is in process.

Admiral CHEW. The fifth project in this group is at the Naval Station, San Diego, Calif., for construction of a nuclear submarine pier at the estimated cost of $1,700,000. This station is responsible for providing logistic support to the operating forces of the Navy. Because of the danger of contaminating the water of San Diego Bay, in consideration of the heavily populated areas along the mainland shores, it is contrary to AEC policies to provide berthing facilities in the inner harbor for nuclear-powered submarines. For this reason, the Navy proposes to construct a pier with adequate utilities to service the nuclear submarines operating with Submarine Flotilla 1 based at San Diego for advanced antisubmarine warfare training and evaluation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the reason that nuclear submarines cannot be operated in the Port of San Diego at the present tender mooring?

Admiral CHEW. The tenders are now inside the harbor and they nest or house their submarines alongside. Inside the harbor there is always a possibility of contamination. I think you might well ask: How is it taken care of at New London or how will it be at Charleston, because they are both going to house or tend nuclear submarines?

In those two areas there is a heavy flow of waters down the rivers, plus the fact that the populated areas are not precisely adjacent as they are around the San Diego Bay.

Consequently, the only acceptable safe place is at the harbor entrance where the danger of contamination is lessened.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the distance from the present mooring to the proposed new facility?

Admiral CHEW. I would say about 2 miles; a mile and a half to 2 miles. You come in the bay and around the corner is where the destroyer moorings and submarine moorings are.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have you checked out to find out: Why can't these nuclear submarines be home ported at other stations on the west coast where existing facilities are adequate?

Admiral CHEW. There is another aspect of this, the fact that this is our basic destroyer and fleet support area. Consequently, for training it would be far more economical to have the submarines which are working with the destroyers, as they have always home ported there where they can achieve their antisubmarine warfare training as can the destroyers.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on the item?

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

NAVAL STATION, TREASURE ISLAND, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next is the Naval Station at Treasure Island, Calif.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL STATION, TREASURE ISLAND	SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA	6029700

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
SAN FRANCISCO - 2 MILES SOUTHWEST	SAN FRANCISCO	CNO-ADMINISTRATION	12TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
LOGISTIC SUPPORT FOR OPERATING NAVAL FORCES	1942	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To provide, as appropriate, logistics support for the operating forces of the Navy, and for dependent activities and other commands as assigned.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	59	542	679	1,567	8,257	11,104
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	55	567	679	*1,567	*8,255	11,123
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	55	567	679	*1,567	*8,255	11,123

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT -	PLANNED -	ULTIMATE -

*OFF - 13, EM - 1,554

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *OFF - 626, EM - 7,629

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	1,095	8,120,000	35,887,000	44,007,000
2. LEASED	-	(-)	-	-
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Cost)		44,007,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				701,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				0
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				8,425,000
			7. GRAND TOTAL	53,133,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11
831	SEWAGE DISPOSAL SYSTEM	MD	0	1.39	1.39	0	701	701	0	701

152

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DD FORM 1390 (7-58) Supersedes Previous Edition

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 16

(See note on following page.)

The preliminary engineering report was prepared by Brown & Caldwell, San Francisco, Calif., for a fee of $10,200, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and the selection of an A. & E. is in process.

Admiral CHEW. The final continental project in the program is for construction of a sewage disposal system at the estimated cost of $701,000 at the Naval Station, Treasure Island, San Francisco, Calif. The station provides logistic support of the operating forces of the Navy. This project was authorized last year in Public Law 86–149, but was not included in the funding program at that time. The Navy discharges raw sewage into San Francisco Bay from the facilities on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island. In October 1954, the California Regional Water Pollution Control Board of region 2 resolved that this pollution of the bay waters is inimical to the welfare of the people of the State. Executive Order 10014 of November 1948 requires cooperation and participation of the Federal Government in local pollution abatement programs. The proposed project would provide for construction of a sewage treatment plant on each of the two islands.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have the local authorities done all that is required of them regarding the construction of sewage disposal facilities?

Admiral PELTIER. This sewage disposal plant will take care only of the Government-generated sewage. It will not be part of any other system on Treasure Island.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There is no other pickup there?

Admiral PELTIER. No. There is a terriffic amount of pollution cleanup in the bay area we are trying to go along with here. There has been tremendous congressional pressure on us to get this done.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is our understanding in the committee, and perhaps it is your understanding as well, that insofar as the city is concerned it is going ahead with its own operations?

Admiral PELTIER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And are not contributing to the problem we have emanating from the island itself?

Admiral PELTIER. We are trying to keep up with them in keeping this bay cleaned.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions upon this particular item?

Mr. JONAS. No, sir, but on this general subject, will there be any discussion in this hearing about the general problem of cleaning up the bay? I heard quite a bit of talk about this while I was in San Francisco last fall.

Admiral PELTIER. We have another project at the naval supply depot.

JOINT U.S. MILITARY MISSION, GOLCUK, TURKEY

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is "Joint U.S. military mission, Golcuk, Turkey."

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
JOINT UNITED STATES MILITARY MISSION	GOLCUK, TURKEY	-

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
GOLCUK, ADJACENT TO CITY	TURKEY	CNO - ADMINISTRATION	EASTERN ATLANTIC AND MEDITERREAN

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
TRAINING OF TURKISH NAVAL PERSONNEL	1948	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To provide advice and assistance in all matters pertaining to operation, administration, training and maintenance for Turkish Naval personnel.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	14	30	0	0	0	44
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	14	30	0	0	0	44
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1962	14	30	0	0	0	44

NO. OF AIRCRAFT — PRESENT: - — PLANNED: - — ULTIMATE: -

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	CONSTRUCTION SITE TO BE PROVIDED BY LEASE			-
2. LEASED	AGREEMENT WITH TURKISH GOVERNMENT			-
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959			(Except Land Rent)	-
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				675,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				125,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				800,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
711	Family Housing - 7 Officers, 20 Enlisted Men	FA	4 (SUBSTANDARD)	32	0	27	800	0	675	675

147

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA

NAVDOCKS 2570 (7-58) Supersedes Previous Edition

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 17

(See note on following page.)

373

The preparation of final plans and specifications were authorized by Bureau letter prepared March 15, 1960. No preliminary engineering report is being authorized but preliminary unit schematics, site plan, and estimate breakdown have been requested for use in support of the project. The tentative site location received from the area public works officer has been approved pending agreement with the Government of Turkey.

Admiral CHEW. There is only one project in this class for an oversea activity. It is for construction of 27 sets of family housing at the estimated cost of $675,000. These units are for 7 married U.S. naval officers and 20 enlisted men and their families assigned to the Joint U.S. military mission at Golcuk, Turkey. The mission of this Navy group is to provide to the Turkish Government advice and assistance in matters pertaining to naval operation, training, and maintenance for Turkish naval personnel related to ships, equipment, and ammunition. There are available now only four sets of quarters in quonset huts. Community housing in Golcuk is scarce and substandard. Some resentment is caused by the competition for the more desirable housing, since U.S. naval personnel can better afford to pay higher rental charges than the Turkish naval personnel.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why is it necessary to have families with personnel at this location?

Admiral CHEW. Mr. Chairman, as you know, there are just 27 married personnel involved. They consist of 7 officers and 20 enlisted men, and they are assigned to the Joint U.S. Military Mission in Golcuk. We have had our married enlisted and officer personnel assigned to these stations and they are also assigned at other stations overseas, as is the standard Navy policy, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From your justification, it appears you are providing housing for half the officer personnel and 66 percent of the enlisted personnel. Isn't this rather high for family housing, or do you have an exception in that particular area?

Admiral CHEW. There will be an exception in this area out of the country because there is practically no community support there. People living there now are living in substandard housing.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think the question I was trying to bring out was based upon the high ratio percentagewise of married people as such. In other words, have we walked into this thing and used a broad law of averages or has this actually been surveyed from that point of view?

Admiral CHEW. It has been surveyed. These are eligible personnel according to DOD criteria.

That is, the upper pay grades with more than 7 years' service, sir, both enlisted and, of course, the officers, I think would fit the standard percentage as we now know it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it indicated from your information that you are going to have a greater amount of enlisted personnel of the higher ratings?

Admiral CHEW. Yes, sir. You see, they are technically trained people for this type work.

Consequently, they would be of higher ratings than you would normally find aboard ship or, say, in a general-purpose station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the tour of duty with and without dependents in this location, generally speaking?

Admiral CHEW. I think the tour of duty here is 2 years, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. With or without dependents?

Admiral CHEW. I think it would be 2 years with dependents and 18 months without dependents.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What attempts have you made to secure this housing by the use of foreign currencies, if any?

Admiral CHEW. This project will be funded with foreign currencies. Only American dollars to the extent of 25 percent of the project may be used. The 25-percent maximum is permitted for the acquisition of those items not readily obtainable with foreign currencies.

Beginning in fiscal year 1961, direct appropriations will be used to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for foreign currencies at the time they are used rather than providing reimbursement from quarters allowances as has been the practice to date.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How long do you anticipate the United States will continue to train Turkish naval personnel, if you know?

Admiral CHEW. I would say the best answer, Mr. Chairman, would be as long as we are an active participant in NATO. That would suggest that we would always meet our commitments toward our NATO allies in that particular respect.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on the item?

Mr. JONAS. This is a joint mission, is it not, with other services?

Admiral CHEW. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. What do the other services do for family quarters?

Admiral CHEW. They have them, sir.

Mr. JONAS. That is all.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the status of the Army and Air Force housing at that particular area?

Admiral CHEW. I will have to furnish the exact number of quarters for the record, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you will, please, in both instances.

(The information requested follows:)

In Turkey, the Army has been authorized to construct 187 family housing units. Due to difficulties which have been encountered, final plans have been developed for the construction of only 114 units at this time. Additional funding to proceed with the 114 units is now pending.

The Air Force has obtained authorization to construct 250 units in the fiscal year program, and 600 units in the fiscal year 1960 program. The 250 units will be constructed utilizing Austrian prefabs. This project has been advertised for bids.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions?

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

Weapons Facilities

Mr. Sheppard. We shall turn now to the weapons facilities area. Mr. Reporter, insert the summary pages at this point.
(The summary pages follow:)

Weapons facilities, fleet support stations, inside the United States

Installation and line item	Proposed funding	Fiscal year authorization
Naval Air Station, Alameda, Calif.: Modification to aircraft fuel facility	$384,000	1961
Naval Air Station, Barber's Point, Oahu, Hawaii:		
Transmitter facility	114,000	1961
Special weapons target	108,000	1961
Total	222,000	
Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Fla.:		
Optical landing system	95,000	1961
Aircraft power check facility	176,000	1961
Total	271,000	
Naval Ammunition Depot, Charleston, S.C.: Classified item	725,000	1961
Naval Degaussing Station, Charleston, S.C.: Degaussing range including land acquisition	235,000	1961
Naval Air Station, Ford Island, Oahu, Hawaii: Dredging	634,000	1959
Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Fla.:		
Aircraft fuel dispensing facilities	178,000	1961
Bombing targets including land acquisition	500,000	[1] 1961
Total	678,000	
Naval Air Station, Lemoore, Calif.:		
Taxiway and airfield pavement	1,453,000	1961
Fuel pipeline, including land acquisition	4,759,000	1961
Photographic building	128,000	1961
Training buildings (2d increment)	758,000	1961
Guided-missile support facility	451,000	1961
Ordnance facilities	577,000	1961
General warehouse	305,000	1961
Flammable storehouse	74,000	1961
Brig	116,000	1961
Commissary	291,000	1961
Commissioned officers' mess (open)	585,000	1961
Enlisted men's club	612,000	1961
Chief petty officers' mess (open)	199,000	1961
Survival training pool	320,000	1961
Service road	28,000	1961
Security fencing	62,000	1961
Site improvement	100,000	1961
Total	10,818,000	
Naval Air Station, Miramar, Calif.:		
Jet engine maintenance shop	1,233,000	1961
Turbojet engine test facility	663,000	1961
Aircraft power check facility	123,000	1961
Total	2,019,000	
Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, Calif.:		
Carrier berthing wharf	5,000,000	1959
Helicopter rotor blade test facility	244,000	1961
Total	5,244,000	
Naval Air Station, Oceana, Va.:		
Runway end zones and crash strips	580,000	1961
Optical landing system	90,000	1961
Aircraft power check facility	295,000	1961
Aircraft maintenance buildings	248,000	1961
Total	1,213,000	

[1] Amendment.

Weapons facilities, fleet support stations, inside the United States—Continued

Installation and line item	Proposed funding	Fiscal year authorization
Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, R.I.:		
Modification of aircraft fuel facility	$674,000	1961
Medium range radar facility	245,000	1961
Total	919,000	
Total weapons facilities, fleet support stations:		
Unclassified items	22,637,000	
Classified item	725,000	
Total	23,362,000	

General Statements

Mr. Sheppard. Admiral Ellis, please give us an overall statement on the program involving the weapons facilities projects.

Admiral Ellis. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Rear Adm. W. E. Ellis, Assistant Chief for Field Support in the Bureau of Naval Weapons. This appearance before you today is my pleasure and first opportunity to represent this new Bur au before your committee. During the last session of the Congress you will recall legislation was enacted which disestablished the Bureau of Aeronautics and the Bureau of Ordnance and permitted the establishment of the Bureau of Naval Weapons.

I have the honor today of assisting in the presentation to you of the first Bureau of Naval Weapons military construction program. Prior to our proceeding with a detailed review of the various line items I should like to briefly outline the facilities and objectives we hope to achieve with this portion of the Navy's fiscal year 1961 military construction program.

The Bureau of Naval Weapons portion of this program totals $55,767,000. Of that total $40,408,000 is for development of U.S. continental facilities and $15,359,000 for oversea stations.

The first group of line items provides essentially for the completion of naval auxiliary air station, Meridian, Miss., as a basic jet training station. Meridian is expected to become fully operational late in the calendar year 1961.

At our fleet support stations our funding requests are principally for the improvement of safety conditions for high performance aircraft operations, for construction required to make Naval Air Station, Lemoore, Calif., operational by October 1961, and for providing berthing of *Forrestal* class carriers at Naval Air Stations, Ford Island, Hawaii, and North Island, Calif.

For Marine Corps air stations our principal objectives are to improve safety of flight conditions for high performance aircraft operations and for extension of utilities to areas not now properly served.

For our special stations we are requesting funding for a particularly significant item—an inertial guidance laboratory at the Naval Air Development Center, Johnsville. The Navy's need for a facility for qualification, test, and exaluation on inertial guidance systems cannot be overemphasized. This need is acute.

The Navy's role as executive agent for the Pacific Missile Range demands the continued development of this important national range. Facilities support is also required for the fleet ballistics missile program (POLARIS) at several locations.

In the oversea area our program is one of correction of existing unsatisfactory conditions rather than major expansion. The line items of greatest significance are those required to provide satisfactory living conditions for officers and enlisted men on Naha, Okinawa, and the extension of a runway at Naval Air Station, Guantanamo Bay.

Admiral CHEW. The second group of projects in the class of naval weapons facilities is for fleet support stations. These include 38 line items at 12 stations in the amount of $23,362,000. Two of the line items were authorized in previous years. All but two of the stations are naval air activities; the excepted two are ordnance activities, one of which, in the amount of $725,000, is classified and will be discussed when the committee takes up the classified section of the program. These stations provide direct support to the operating forces of the Navy.

NAVAL AIR STATION, ALAMEDA, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The first item we shall pick up is the Naval Air Station at Alameda.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL AIR STATION	ALAMEDA, CALIFORNIA	1452064
4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	**5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY**	**6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE**	**7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA**
ALAMEDA, WITHIN CITY	ALAMEDA, SAN FRANCISCO	BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS	12TH NAVAL DISTRICT
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
SUPPORT FLEET AVIATION ACTIVITIES	1942	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

Maintain and operate facilities and provide services and material to support operations of aviation activities and units of the Operating Forces of the Navy and other activities and units, as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	93	1254	7460	0	3072	11,879
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	93	1444	7826	0	4331	13,694
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	87	1425	7826	0	6398*	15,736

NO. OF AIRCRAFT — PRESENT 350 — PLANNED 446 — ULTIMATE 426

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *OFF 1234 EM 5164

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	2525	6,776,000	74,133,000	80,909,000
2. LEASED	160	(-) (Except Land Rent)	1,138,000	1,138,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959				82,047,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				4,661,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				384,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				16,814,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				103,906,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY				AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11
124	MODIFICATION TO AIRCRAFT FUEL FACILITY	GA	765,324 (51,335 SUBSTANDARD)	- *	- *	-	384	0	384	384
711	FAMILY HOUSING - CAPEHART	FA	1,108 (949 SUBSTANDARD)	5,364	0	900	-	-	-	

* MODIFICATION ONLY

Admiral CHEW. The first project is for modification of the aircraft fuel facility at the Naval Air Station, Alameda, Calif., at the estimated cost of $384,000. This is the industrial-seaport station of the Lemoore master jet complex. The existing aviation fuel facilities are operated on a water displacement, or "aqua," system. Modification of these facilities is necessary to permit maintenance of quality control. Jet fuel must be separated from the aqua system because its specific gravity approaches that of water and some of its additives are soluble in water. These deficiencies must be corrected to avoid the possibilities of having contaminated fuels delivered to aircraft and aircraft carriers, thereby creating hazards to flight operations which endanger lives and property.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What type construction do you plan for family housing under the Capehart Act at this installation and where do you propose to locate it?

Admiral CHEW. This is purely a replacement of the present inadequate housing now located just adjacent to the station at Alameda.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you believe under this request you will be able to provide adequate housing in this area, within the Capehart cost limitations?

Admiral PELTIER. I think we can, Mr. Chairman. It was a construction factor of one. I see no reason why we cannot do this, particularly since we are going on land where our utilities should not be too expensive.

We should have some existing facilities there.

We haven't done too much engineering on this yet.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is being done to clear up the debris problem as it prevails in the bay area, gentlemen?

Admiral CHEW. Mr. Chairman, going back to another project which is in the bay area, we have construction of a sewage collection line for—you are not speaking of sewage?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am only talking about the debris. You have got a tremendous amount of floating debris in that area. When we were out there, we were told very definitely that those so-called private contractors that have log booms out over certain coastal properties will let it get piled up and they will slip up about 2 o'clock, pull the pin, it opens up and goes out in the bay. Nobody knows about it. You people are running up the bay with tugs and everything else. We want to know how much it is costing you, because we might induce our friends in San Francisco to do a little better policing of that job if we get the information from you people.

Admiral CHEW. I have heard of the difficult situation that exists particularly around Mare Island, but I have not known of any particular project that has been initiated either by the Navy or anyone else to clear up the debris other than the normal precautions you would take in navigating.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think you will find on closer review of this thing that your problem is really involving not only the outside, because there is plenty of it, but this is right in the seadrome area.

Admiral CHEW. The seaplanes have actually been moved out. I think that probably was one of the reasons, because of the harbor condition. The seaplanes are actually out, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I will tell you what I want you to do, if you will, please, because there is quite a problem involved here. If you have to teletype out to the command to find out what the condition is, I wish you would find out what they are doing there now to obviate that situation. Have it so you can supply it for the record when it comes down, will you, please?

Admiral CHEW. Yes, sir.

(The following was submitted later:)

The commandant of the 12th Naval District furnished on April 9, 1960, the following information:

With regard to the origin of the debris, the primary offenders contributing to the problem have been commercially operated dumps and general debris areas used as illegal dumps on property bordering the bay, waterfront structures in advanced state of decay, and river discharge. These sources produce such typical debris as construction materials, timbers, wood piling and dunnage, metal drums and cans, woodboxes, crates, and scraps, logs, brush, bottles, and paper which is concentrated in the Oakland estuary and in San Francisco Bay and its tributaries extending from Sacramento and Stockton to Alviso, Calif.

The magnitude of the debris problem has adversely affected both air and surface naval operations in the bay area. For example, seaplane operations at the Alameda Naval Air Station seadrome have been eliminated at night and restricted during daylight hours. It has limited military and civilian small-craft operations in the bay area and is a present danger to military and commercial shipping.

Certain remedial measures are being pursued to alleviate the problem. Seadrome sweeping operations are conducted by the Corps of Engineers and NAS, Alameda. The Army Engineers are policing operations at commercial and other dump areas while the naval activities in the bay area are conducting police and cleanup campaigns at their respective stations. A campaign to enlist public help and support is currently underway using public relations media such as press conferences, radio, and television broadcasts. A bay area cleanup drive of San Francisco Bay and its beaches is scheduled for April 23 and 24 involving 5,000 pleasure and military small craft with Navy, Army, Coast Guard, Boy Scout, Sea Scout, and civilian personnel taking part. The State of California Regional Water Pollution Control Board of the San Francisco Bay Region is actively spearheading the water pollution abatement program and is coordinating the efforts of the civilian and military agencies involved.

Primary responsibility for the control of the debris problem in San Francisco Bay is vested in the Army Corps of Engineers. The Navy is prepared to render all possible support to the Army in their efforts to cope with the problem.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions upon this item?

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

NAVAL AIR STATION, BARBER'S POINT, OAHU, HAWAII

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item has to do with the Naval Air Station at Barber's Point, Oahu, Hawaii.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL AIR STATION	BARBER'S POINT, OAHU, HAWAII	1452-160
4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	**5. COUNTY/COUNTRY**	**6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE**	**7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA**
HONOLULU, 30 MILES EAST	HONOLULU COUNTY	BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS	14TH NAVAL DISTRICT
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
SUPPORT FLEET AIR OPERATIONS	1942	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

Maintain and operate facilities and provide services and material to support operations of aviation activities and units of the Operating Forces of the Navy and other Activities and units, as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL		OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT	1 JANUARY 1960	79	814	633	0	4,748	6,274
2. PLANNED - END FY	1961	84	881	647	0	4,976	6,588
3. ULTIMATE - END FY	1963	80	917	647	0	5,209*	6,853

NO. OF AIRCRAFT — PRESENT 146 | PLANNED 188 | ULTIMATE 230

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *834 OFF. AND 4,375 EM

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	33,818	941,000	86,674,000	87,615,000
2. LEASED	3,173	(2,526)	106,000	106,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		87,721,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				628,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				222,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				15,163,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				103,734,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION			PHYSICAL CAPACITY				AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)				
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11	
131	TRANSMITTER FACILITY	SF	908 (SUBSTANDARD)	498	0	498	114	0	114	114	65
179	SPECIAL WEAPONS TARGET	EA	0	1	0	1	108	0	108	108	64
								TOTAL	222	222	

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DD FORM 1870 (7-60) Supersedes Previous Edition

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 20

379

(See notes on following page.)

TRANSMITTER FACILITY

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by the district public works officer, 14th Naval District, and is complete.

Final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being prepared by the district public works officer, 14th Naval District.

SPECIAL WEAPONS TARGET

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by the district public works officer, 14th Naval District, and is complete.

Final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being prepared by the district public works officer, 14th Naval District.

Admiral CHEW. The second project, at the Naval Air Station, Barber's Point, Oahu, Hawaii, consists of two line items for $222,000.

The first line item is for construction of a transmitter facility at the estimated cost of $114,000. This is required in order that the station may have positive control of aircraft flight operations at all times. This positive control does not exist at the present time. The existing transmitting facilities are in six separate buildings. Many station structures between the transmitting facilities and large areas of the runways, taxiways, and air traffic patterns mask the line of sight and create blind spots wherein radio communcation to and from aircraft is impossible. The heavy aircraft traffic, including the airborne early warning aircraft, and the frequent mixing of jet and propeller-driven aircraft in the same traffic pattern make it essential to provide positive control and eliminate the present dangerous condition.

The second line item is for provision of a special weapons target at the estimated cost of $108,000. It is requisite for all aircraft units of the fleet to be proficient in delivery of special weapons. There is no existing target in the Hawaiian area suitable for training the fleet personnel to attain the necessary proficiency. The Navy proposes to provide the needed target facilities at Kuana Point, approximately 185 nautical miles southeast of Barber's Point on the Island of Hawaii. This will permit continuous and efficient training of personnel in high- and low-altitude bombing and low-altitude loft delivery of special weapons. Here, the instrumentation will be installed for control of the aircraft during the precision approach and release operations mandatory to the training in proper delivery of the special weapons. The facilities will also be used for final training of naval and Marine Corps air groups in the Hawaiian area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you doing with the special weapons targets to be located and do you have access to the necessary real estate, if any, that is required for this work?

Admiral CHEW. There is no requirement in regard to the target, Mr. Chairman. There is no existing target in the Hawaiian area suitable for training the fleet personnel to attain the necessary proficiency. We propose to provide the needed target facilities at Kuana Point approximately 185 nautical miles southeast of Barber's Point on the Island of Hawaii. This will permit continuous and efficient training of personnel in high- and low-altitude bombing and low-altitude loft delivery of special weapons. Here the instrumentation will be installed for control of the aircraft during the precision approach and release operations mandatory to the training in proper delivery of the special weapons.

The facilities will also be used for final training of naval and Marine Corps air groups in the Hawaiian area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have to have targets, special weapons, supporting features including warmup pads, standby generator plant, security fencing and roads, as indicated on page 20–B of the justifications?

Admiral CHEW. That is right, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on this item?

Mr. JONAS. Has any consideration been given or is it being given to moving this transmitter field from Barber's Point?

Admiral CHEW. This is not a big transmitter activity or facility, Mr. Jonas. This is for the control of planes actually coming into the field. We do have radio facilities there now but through some quirk of radio that I am not familiar with there are blind spots and we have actually lost positive control of the aircraft and have had several casualties because of the loss of control. This is to eliminate this hazardous condition within the local communication network.

Mr. JONAS. As far as you know, no consideration has been given to moving this to some other location?

Admiral CHEW. None at all, sir.

NAVAL AIR STATION, CECIL FIELD, FLA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item, Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Fla.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL AIR STATION, CECIL FIELD	JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA	1452215

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
JACKSONVILLE, 13 MILES NORTHEAST	DUVAL	BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS	6TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
SUPPORT FLEET AVIATION ACTIVITIES	1942	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

Maintain and operate facilities and provide services and material to support operations of aviation activities and units of the Operating Forces of the Navy and other activities and units, as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	50	619	394	0	3094	4157
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	52	573	404	0	3274	4303
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	50	579	404	0	3939*	4972

NO. OF AIRCRAFT — PRESENT 188 — PLANNED 271 — ULTIMATE 305

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *OFF 484 EM 3455

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	17,684	580,000	26,911,000	27,491,000
2. LEASED	627	(-)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Cost)		27,491,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				19,502,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				271,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				14,167,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				61,431,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY				AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11
134	OPTICAL LANDING SYSTEM	EA	0	4	2	2	235	140	95	95
211	AIRCRAFT POWER CHECK FACILITY	SY	1,875 (SUBSTANDARD)	2,625	0	1,875	195	0	176	176
								TOTAL	271	271

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DD FORM 1390 (7-58) Supersedes Previous Edition

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 21

382

7
66

OPTICAL LANDING SYSTEM

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Smith & Gillespie, engineers, Jacksonville, Fla., and is complete at a fee of $1,480.
The final plans and specifications have been authorized and will be accomplished by the same firm. The fee has not been negotiated.

AIRCRAFT POWER CHECK FACILITY

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Smith & Gillespie, engineers, Jacksonville, Fla., and is complete at a fee of $2,950.
The final plans and specifications have been authorized and will be accomplished by the same firm. The fee has not been negotiated.

Admiral CHEW. The third project is at the Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Fla. It consists of two line items in the amount of $271,000. This is one of the Navy's four master jet fields.

The first line item is for an optical landing system at the estimated cost of $95,000. It is similar to a line item I described previously for the Air Training Station at Meridian. This will provide for installation of a mirror and lights unit at one end each of two runways. Two such units were previously authorized for this station and are in operation. This landing aid is used to train pilots for carrier aircraft landings by bringing them in on a controlled light beam glidepath so as to avoid undershoots and overruns. Its proper use assures the pilot in landing aircraft that he is approaching the runway at the proper angle for touching down on the runway paving near the threshold in order to take full advantage of the usable length of the runway. This is essential for the heavy planes and high landing speeds of modern jet aircraft. It is proved as a factor in reducing accident rates.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for a facility for runup tests and power checks at this station now?

Admiral CHEW. The second line item is for construction of an aircraft power check facility, at the estimated cost of $176,000. This is also similar to one of the line items for Meridian which I discussed previously. It will permit of testing four aircraft simultaneously. Runup tests and adjustments are required on jet engines after each replacement, after periodic maintenance checks, line maintenance repairs, and frequently, in the investigation of pilot discrepancy reports subsequent to flight. For safe full power runup tests the facility must be capable of withstanding high horizontal thrust loadings and, at the same time, must provide protection of personnel from engine failures, and of material and equipment from the effects of blast and high temperatures. High power runup testing is the best method for evaluating the performance of jet engines prior to flight.

The aircraft power check facility will be capable of testing four aircraft simultaneously and the facilities that we now have, as I remember it, Admiral—do you know? These are antiquated facilities and cannot be relied upon under the heavy thrust of these new aircraft.

Admiral ELLIS. That is correct.

Admiral CHEW. That is essentially the problem. We have facilities there now. This is a modernization to provide them for the newer and heavier aircraft, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice on page 21a you have listed optical landing system installation, communication lines, control lines installation, and under supporting features, power cabling, duct lines, and handholes.

Admiral CHEW. The optical landing system is the same you have authorized many times before, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions upon this item?

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

NAVAL DEGAUSSING STATION, CHARLESTON, S.C.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is the Naval Degaussing Station, Charleston, S.C.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL DEGAUSSING STATION	CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA	2733 175

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. Over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
CHARLESTON, WITHIN CITY	CHARLESTON	BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS	6TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
DEGAUSSING AND DEPERMING OPERATIONS	1942	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

Maintain and operate degaussing facilities and provide degaussing services as directed by the Bureau of Naval Weapons.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1959	2	23	6	-	-	31
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	2	19	7	-	-	28
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	2	19	7	-	-	28

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	PLANNED	ULTIMATE
	-	-	-

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	1	0	184,000	184,000
2. LEASED	0.7	($360/yr.)	52,000	52,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		(236,000*)
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				235,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				0
*Value $0 when station is relocated			7. GRAND TOTAL	235,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11
159	DEGAUSSING RANGE INCLUDING LAND ACQUISITION	SF	1,500	4,200	0	4,200	235	0	235	235

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DD FORM 1390 (7-58) Supersedes DD FORM 1390

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 22

(See note at top of following page.)

385

74

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Cummings & McCrady, Charleston, S.C., and is complete at a fee of $6,350.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and selection of an architect and engineering firm is underway in the office of the district public works officer, 6th Naval District.

Admiral CHEW. The fourth project, an ordnance activity, in the fleet support stations group, is at the Naval Degaussing Station, Charleston, S.C., for a degaussing range and land acquisition at the estimated cost of $235,000. The title of the station and project indicates the mission of this activity. To degauss a ship is to neutralize its normal magnetic field, thus rendering the ship no longer liable to deflect the needle in the detonating device of a magnetic mine. The various naval ships home-ported and operating in the Charleston area must be degaussed periodically—minecraft quarterly and destroyers and submarines semiannually. The existing range is on leased land which must be vacated to permit commencement of port construction this year by the South Carolina State Port Authority. Approximately 3 acres of land will be acquired along the Cooper River opposite Castle Pinckney as the site of the facility, on which it is planned to construct the degaussing range house and a small boat pier. The degaussing ranges will be provided in the adjacent river area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. With the available land which the Government owns in the Charleston area, plus the additional money the committee is putting into this location at the present time, why is it necessary to buy land for this station at a cost in excess of $9,000 per acre?

Admiral CHEW. Mr. Chairman, we already have a station but unfortunately the existing station is on leased land which must be vacated to permit commencement of the port construction this year by the South Carolina State Port Authority. Inasmuch as our chief minecraft base is in Charleston, it is most important that these minecraft be properly degaussed. In addition to that, since it is the home port of destroyers they must also be degaussed. I would safely say, sir, if we weren't being forced out, I am sure we would not like to purchase land to erect another station.

Mr. JONAS. Will you yield, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes. I yielded to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. How long is the lease? Is the lease up, or are you just moving out or giving it up because the State wants to do something?

Admiral CHEW. Actually, we are being forced out, sir.

Mr. JONAS. Not if you have a lease. It must be expiring.

Admiral CHEW. I can get the exact date of expiration.

Mr. TIENCKEN. The lease provided for a termination by the South Carolina State Port Authority and they have notified us accordingly.

Mr. JONAS. They have exercised option to terminate?

Mr. TIENCKEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. So you are legally bound to leave?

Admiral CHEW. Yes, sir.

Admiral PELTIER. It expired June 30, 1959. We are in there now under a temporary extension which provides that Navy will move when the Navy use interferes with construction now underway.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Your actual procurement is 3 acres. You have 2½ acres of submerged land. What are you doing with the submerged land?

Admiral PELTIER. It is the land adjacent that we are going to have to use there.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Who owns this land?

Mr. TIENCKEN. This is also State port authority property.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, the whole 3 acres, then, is under the ownership of one party? You say it is the State?

Mr. TIENCKEN. State port authority.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The State port authority owns it?

Mr. TIENCKEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have had under lease the complete 3 acres over the past, is that correct?

Admiral PELTIER. Not this particular site. Here is a small map of that, Mr. Chairman.

Here is the existing strip here. We are going to move down to here. They are developing their port in here. We are going to move down to here.

Mr. SHEPPARD. My question was you need a portion of this, but what are you going to do with the submerged property? Is that usable or are you taking it in because it is available? What is the problem?

Admiral PELTIER. We have to use submerged land because of the degaussing. The tubes go under the water. We have to control all of that area. We have to control submerged land.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the justifications, the only conclusion I could reach is that 2½ acres out of 3 apparently have been used.

Mr. JONAS. Who else could use submerged lands besides the Navy? Are they not holding you up by that price?

Mr. TIENCKEN. Mr. Jonas, the port authority has been interested in renting us this property. They have offered us a lease for 50 years at a nominal consideration, and we are giving serious consideration to the leasing of the property rather than the purchasing of it.

Admiral PELTIER. I have heard unofficially that the port authority has again changed its mind and wants to sell.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then the figure of $9,000 per acre is not a firm figure at the moment. Is that it?

Admiral PELTIER. It is our best estimate on our appraisal of this land value.

Mr. JONAS. How much an acre?

Admiral PELTIER. This is $9,000, waterfront land.

Mr. JONAS. Under water.

Mr. SHEPPARD. 2½ acres under water and 1½ not under water, as I interpret the statement in the justifications. Is that correct? The actual price appears high, of course, but it is waterfront property.

Admiral PELTIER. Yes, it is right on the waterfront.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, if it is waterfront property, because of the locations who else would they have who might be a customer for the land? Anybody? This is what I am getting at, and I am going to put it on the record: It looks to me like the State is holding you up down there. Are they or are they not?

Mr. TIENCKEN. If we can lease the property for a nominal consideration, apparently we will be away ahead. The port authority apparently is wavering as to whether they want to sell it to us or lease it to us. If we have to purchase it, this property in this particular area is now being reclaimed and redeveloped for high-grade housing. It is right next to the battery at Charleston. It is being reclaimed and promoted into very high-grade residential property. That has accelerated the value of it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There is no place in the area that you could locate this and avoid this situation. Is that correct?

Admiral PELTIER. We have made a study of this thing with our engineers and have come up with the best answer to the problem.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When the record comes down, Admiral Peltier, I think you had better make a pretty close check, surveying this area to see if anything in this area could be used at a lesser price, to see if there is any other thing than this patch of 3 acres.

Admiral PELTIER. There is a technical requirement on this degaussing with which I am not completely familiar. You have to locate this in just certain locations.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is fine. That does not appear in the justifications. Those are all considerations, gentlemen, which may make this particular place essential as compared to some other place which on the surface would appear to be available, but when you get into the other aspect there is some interjection which would preclude that type of operation. I interpret, Admiral Peltier, you had reference to that possibility.

Admiral PELTIER. We actually studied nine sites, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on the item?

Mr. JONAS. No, but I concur in your comment. We need a little more supporting information to justify this construction.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When the record comes down, I think it might be well if you supplied that, if you would please.

(The information requested follows:)

Of the nine possible available sites, the site selected most nearly meets the following site requirements: (1) Provides navigable water convenient to naval vessel traffic on a north-south course; (2) the long axis of the range must be on an east-west magnetic bearing; (3) has required water depth for installation of the 15, 30, and 50 to 70 foot depth ranges; (4) all three ranges are on the same line of sight for optical sighting of vessels; (5) the site is clear of navigational hazards and is subject to a minimum of silting; (6) water currents are normal to the range for ease of ship handling and; (7) provides free running distance and turning area on each end of the range.

It is planned to acquire the use of the land by means of a long-term lease at a nominal cost from the State port authority.

NAVAL AIR STATION, FORD ISLAND, HAWAII

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next we shall consider the Naval Air Station, Ford Island, Hawaii.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL AIR STATION, FORD ISLAND	PEARL HARBOR, OAHU, HAWAII	1452724

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
HONOLULU, 8 MILES SOUTHEAST	HAWAII	BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS	14TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
MAINTAIN NAS FACILITIES IN A MAINTENANCE STATUS	1919	[X] MAINTENANCE [ ] ACTIVE [ ] INACTIVE [ ] NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To maintain facilities in a "maintenance" status. Provide family housing for a minimum number of fleet aviation personnel; provide limited services to temporarily berthed ships within the limits of funds and personnel available; provide limited support on a reimbursable basis for Headquarters JTF-7. The station is designated as an Auxiliary Landing Field to NAS Barbers'.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JULY 1959	11	107	158	0	1,157	1,433*
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	11	107	158	0	1,157	1,433*
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	11	107	158	0	1,157	1,433*

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	PLANNED	ULTIMATE
	0	0	0

**186 OFF. - 971 EM

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *SUPPORTED BY NAS BARBERS PT.

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS
1. OWNED	447	311,000	26,174,000	26,485,000
2. LEASED	0	(0)	0	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Cost)		26,485,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				1,271,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				0
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				1,792,000
			7. GRAND TOTAL	29,548,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11
151	DREDGING	CY	-	400,000	400,000	0	634	634	0	634

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DAVENPORT 2870 (7-60) Obsoletes Previous Edition

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 23

(See note at top of following page.)

68

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by the district public works officer, 14th Naval District, and is complete.

Final plans and specifications have been prepared by the district public works officer, 14th Naval District.

Admiral CHEW. The fifth project is for dredging at the estimated cost of $634,000 at the Naval Air Station, Ford Island, Oahu, Hawaii. This is part of a project authorized by Public Law 85–685 in the fiscal year 1959 program and approved for funding at that time. This station is in maintenance status and is an auxiliary to the Naval Air Station, Barber's Point. It provides limited services to ships. At the present time there is no usable berth in Pearl Harbor for *Forrestal* class carriers. The Ford Island pier is required to provide such berthing in order that the carriers can be furnished logistic support, including ammunition, at a single location. To make this possible, dredging of the channel area is required to a 40-feet depth to accommodate the large modern carriers.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does this project replace the request in last year's bill which was denied by the Congress for $1,271,000 for the modification of a pier at this location for *Forrestal* class carriers?

Admiral CHEW. It does, sir. This is the dredging alone to allow the carriers to operate around the island. Originally a pier modification and dredging were included. This is dredging alone, to provide for safe navigation for the bigger carriers.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How are you handling carriers in Pearl Harbor at the present time?

Admiral CHEW. We can handle them at two places. We can handle them at the shipyard, which is not good from an operational point of view, and under ideal conditions we have been able to handle them at the present dock on Ford Island, sir. That again is marginal.

Here again, Mr. Chairman, in order to get our program within reasonable limits, we went to the thing we need the most—the dredging to insure the safe passage of the carriers around the island.

Mr. JONAS. Will the chairman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Go right ahead.

Mr. JONAS. You will ask for the pier, then, next year? You will have to have the pier, will you not?

Admiral CHEW. No, sir. We have facilities in Pearl Harbor at which we can at the present time berth the larger carriers. We can do it at the yard. You would not normally do that and take up repair space for an operational carrier. This is when the carrier comes in and conducts part of its training prior to WESPAC deployment.

NAVAL AIR STATION, JACKSONVILLE, FLA.

Next, is the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Fla.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL AIR STATION	JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA	1152436
4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	**5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY**	**6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE**	**7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA**
JACKSONVILLE - 2 MILES NORTH	DUVAL, CLAY, MARION	BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS	6TH NAVAL DISTRICT
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
SUPPORT FLEET AVIATION ACTIVITIES	1940	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

Maintain and operate facilities and provide services and material to support operations of aviation activities and units of the Operating Forces of the Navy and other activities and units, as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	106	1,427	4,829	2,757	5,704	14,823
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	91	1,242	4,489	0	5,597	11,419
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	89	1,262	4,489	0	6,322*	12,162

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT 367	PLANNED 405	ULTIMATE 428

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *OFF 1,014 EM 5,308

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	14,422	352,000	64,345,000	64,697,000
2. LEASED	815	(450)	162,000	162,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		64,859,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				3,217,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST INCLUDING $500,000 AMENDMENT				678,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				9,398,000
			7. GRAND TOTAL	78,152,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY				AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11
125	AIRCRAFT FUEL DISPENSING FACILITIES	MI	16.2	1.0	0	1.0	178	0	178	178
911	BOMBING TARGETS INCLUDING LAND ACQUISITION (AMENDMENT)	NA	-	-	-	-	925	922 TOTAL	500* / 678	500* / 678

* For work uncompleted to date

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION-REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DAYDOCKS 2570 (7-58) Supersedes FormNo 4080

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 34

(See notes on following page.)

391

AIRCRAFT FUEL DISPENSING FACILITIES

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Smith & Gillespie, engineers, Jacksonville, Fla., and is complete at a fee of $2,000.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and selection of an architect and engineer is in process.

BOMBING TARGETS INCLUDING LAND ACQUISITION

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by the public works officer, Naval Air Station, Jacksonville.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed for the Rodman target by the public works officer, Naval Air Station, Jacksonville.

The final plans and specifications for Baywood target will also be prepared by the public works officer, Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, after the land is acquired.

Admiral CHEW. The sixth project consists of two line items for $678,000 at the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Fla. This is the industrial-seaport station of the Cecil Field master jet complex, and is similar in that respect to Alameda on the west coast.

The first line item is for construction of aircraft fuel dispensing facilities at the estimated cost of $173,000. Certain alterations, replacements, and additions to the fuel facilities are required as a safety factor. At present, four aviation fuels are carried, two for jets and two for conventional aircraft. An additional tank is urgently needed, not for increased capacity, but for settling of the jet fuel. This station tank can be made available by pumping one of the jet fuels direct from storage to Cecil Field. Also, a number of the fuel pipelines are old and are failing. Fifty percent have already been replaced. The remainder should be replaced immediately. The proposed line item will provide for the necessary pumping facilities and replacement pipelines. It will also provide for relocation of the truck fill stand which at present is a serious fire hazard as it is only 120 feet from the center of a taxiway.

The second line item is for an increase of $500,000 in the amount originally authorized in Public Law 161, 84th Congress, for the naval air station. There were six line items in the original projects at the total estimated cost of $2,224,000. Of these six line items, three are completed and two are nearly complete, for a cost now estimated to be $1,799,000, as compared to the original estimate of $1,302,000, leaving only $425,000 available for the remaining line item, bombing targets including land acquisition. Since this final item is estimated to cost $925,000, the additional $500,000 is required for its completion.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In the fiscal year 1959 bill, you requested and Congress approved $389,000 for bombing target requirements at this air station. Last year you requested $700,000 for this requirement, which Congress approved. Now we find in the presentation of this budget $500,000 for apparently the same requirement. What is the story back of that, gentlemen?

Admiral CHEW. Here is the story, sir, on the increase of $500,000 in the amount originally authorized in Public Law 161, 84th Congress. There were six line items in the original projects at a total estimated cost of $2,224,000. Of these six line items, three are completed and

two are nearly complete, for a cost now estimated to be $1,799,000 as compared to the original estimate of $1,302,000, leaving only $425,000 available for the remaining line item, that is, the bombing targets, including land acquisition. Since this final item is estimated to cost $925,000, the additional $500,000 is required for its completion.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Am I right in interpreting the presentation in the justification and the explanation you have just given that originally this was supposed to be a one-increment job, but now for some reason we have found necessary what I assume to be three increments? Is that right or wrong?

Admiral CHEW. There were six line items, sir. We have completed three and have nearly completed two, and this one has now gone over from our total authorized expenditure to complete at a cost of $925,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you need another $500,000 to complete what your original estimate did not cover. Is that correct?

Admiral CHEW. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What caused the increase?

Admiral PELTIER. It was distributed among four of those line items previously. The photographic lab went over. The warmup apron went over a little, as did the communications facility. The land cost of one of the outlying fields has gone up, too. We were not able to buy that initially.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is the increase due to change orders, to additional requirements, basically, Admiral Peltier?

Admiral PELTIER. The estimates on the communications facilities particularly were low. There were some changed requirements. The original estimates were low on some of those jobs.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that due to the U.S. Navy making an error, or due to the A. & E. people making a mistake?

Admiral PELTIER. It was due to the Navy not coming up with the right figure to the Congress.

(Off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. What does the Air Force have in the same area?

Admiral CHEW. Mr. Hanabury, have you any information on what the Air Force has in the same area?

Mr. HANABURY. No, sir; but the Air Force requirement in the area have been reduced to the point whereby the committee last year approved our request for Pinecastle. You recall our testifying on that, Mr. Chairman. That is now under contract.

Mr. SHEPPARD. They have reduced their operations within the area; is that true?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you know at the moment or can you provide for the record the degree to which they have diminished their operations there?

Mr. HANABURY. I will try to provide that for the record if I can get it.

(The information requested follows:)

AIR FORCE TARGET REQUIREMENTS IN JACKSONVILLE AREA

In the past few years, Air Force target requirements have diminished to the extent that they have released to the Navy two target areas in the Jacksonville,

Fla., area. These targets are the Pinecastle impact area located northwest of Orlando, Fla., released in 1956 and the Townsend target southwest of Savannah, Ga., released in 1959. Although the Townsend target has been made available to the Navy, FAA has rescinded the airspace restriction over this target. Until such time as FAA designates the airspace as restricted, this target is unusable.

The Air Force states that, in the foreseeable future, they cannot see any further diminishing requirements for bombing targets in the Jacksonville area.

NAVAL AIR STATION, LEMOORE, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we pick the Naval Air Station at Lemoore, Calif.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL AIR STATION	LEMOORE, CALIFORNIA	
4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	**5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY**	**6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE**	**7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA**
HANFORD, 17 MILES NORTHEAST	KINGS, FRESNO	BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS	12TH NAVAL DISTRICT
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
SUPPORT FLEET AVIATION ACTIVITIES	1961	☐ MAINTENANCE ☐ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☒ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To maintain and operate facilities and provide services and material to support operations of aviation activities and units of the Operating Forces of the Navy and other activities and units, as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JAN 1960	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1962	60	579	416	0	4703 *	5758

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	PLANNED	ULTIMATE
	0	0	330

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *OFF 550 EM 4153

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	19,752**			0
2. LEASED	11,049**	[ ]		0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		0
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				80,031,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				10,818,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				4,662,000
**NOT IN INVENTORY JULY 1959			7. GRAND TOTAL	95,511,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY				AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)				
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11	
112	TAXIWAYS AND AIRFIELD PAVEMENTS	SY	0	1,756,585	1,406,585	120,000	27,600	22,246	1,453	1,453	99
125	FUEL PIPELINE INCLUDING LAND ACQUISITION	MI	0	90	0	90	4,759	0	4,759	4,759	98
141	PHOTOGRAPHIC BUILDING	SF	0	4,200	0	4,200	128	0	128	128	108
171	TRAINING BUILDINGS (2ND INCREMENT)	SF	0	80,774	42,028	38,746	1,749	991	758	758	107
212	GUIDED MISSILE SUPPORT FACILITY	SF	0	8,830	0	8,830	451	0	451	451	102

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DD FORM 1390 (7-58) Supersedes DD Form 1390

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 25

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE 17 FEBRUARY 1960
INSTALLATION NAME: NAVAL AIR STATION	LOCATION: LEMOORE, CALIFORNIA	INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.: -

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (Continued)

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)				
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
422	ORDNANCE FACILITIES	SF	0	15,930	0	15,930	577	0	577	577	101
442	GENERAL WAREHOUSE	SF	0	95,815	46,000	42,500	923	555	305	305	103
442	FLAMMABLE STOREHOUSE	SF	0	13,106	0	6,000	162	0	74	74	100
730	BRIG	SF	0	3,600	0	3,600	116	0	116	116	126
740	COMMISSARY	SF	0	15,100	0	15,100	291	0	291	291	127
740	COMMISSIONED OFFICERS' MESS (OPEN)	SF	0	13,860	0	13,860	585	0	585	585	129
740	ENLISTED MEN'S CLUB	SF	0	27,800	0	27,800	612	0	612	612	131
740	CHIEF PETTY OFFICERS' MESS (OPEN)	SF	0	7,260	0	7,260	199	0	199	199	130
750	SURVIVAL TRAINING POOL	SF	0	21,100	0	21,100	320	0	320	320	104
851	SERVICE ROAD	SY	0	7,777	0	7,777	28	0	28	28	128
872	SECURITY FENCING	LF	0	76,400	0	76,400	62	0	62	62	106
932	SITE IMPROVEMENT	AC	0	4,000	0	1,000	340	0	100	100	105
								TOTAL	10,818	10,818	

TAXIWAYS AND AIRFIELD PAVEMENTS

The preliminarly engineering report for this item was prepared by district public works officer, 12th Naval District, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by the district public works officer, 12th Naval District.

FUEL PIPELINE INCLUDING LAND ACQUISITION

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Earl & Wright, San Francisco, Calif., and is complete, at a fee of $23,000.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by the same firm, at a fee of $214,700.

PHOTOGRAPHIC BUILDING

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Lemoore Engineers, San Francisco, Calif., and is complete, at a pro rata fee of $1,380.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by the same firm, at a pro rata fee of $6,900.

TRAINING BUILDINGS (SECOND INCREMENT)

The preliminary engineering reports for this item were prepared by Urbahn, Brayton & Burrows & M. T. Pflueger, San Francisco, Calif., and Lemoore Engineers, San Francisco, Calif., and are complete, at a pro rata fee of $6,690.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by the same firms, at a pro rata fee of $40,800.

GUIDED MISSILE SUPPORT FACILITY

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Lemoore Engineers, San Francisco, Calif., and is complete, at a pro rata fee of $5,980.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by the same firm, at a pro rata fee of $18,300.

ORDNANCE FACILITIES

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by district public works officer, 12th Naval District, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by Lemoore Engineers, San Francisco, Calif., at a pro rata fee of $17,000.

GENERAL WAREHOUSE

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Urbahn, Brayton & Burrows & M. T. Pflueger, San Francisco, Calif., and is complete, at a pro rata fee of $3,110.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by the same firm, at a pro rata fee of $16,300.

FLAMMABLE STOREHOUSE

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Urbahn, Brayton & Burrows & M. T. Pflueger, San Francisco, Calif., and is complete, at at a pro rata fee of $800.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by the same firm, at a pro rata fee of $4,000.

BRIG

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Urbahn, Brayton & Burrows & M. T. Pflueger, San Francisco, Calif., and is complete, at a pro rata fee of $1,240.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by the same firm, at a pro rata fee of $6,200.

COMMISSARY

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Urbahn, Brayton & Burrows & M. T. Pflueger, San Francisco, Calif., and is complete, at a pro rata fee of $3,030.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by the same firm, at a pro rata fee of $15,600.

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS' MESS (OPEN)

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Urbahn, Brayton & Burrows & M. T. Pflueger, San Francisco, Calif., and is complete, at a pro rata fee of $5,010.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by the same firm, at a pro rata fee of $31,400.

ENLISTED MEN'S CLUB

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Urbahn, Brayton & Burrows & M. T. Pflueger, San Francisco, Calif., and is complete, at a pro rata fee of $6,380.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by the same firm, at a pro rata fee of $32,800.

CHIEF PETTY OFFICERS' MESS (OPEN)

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Urbahn, Brayton & Burrows & M. T. Pflueger, San Francisco, Calif., and is complete, at a pro rata fee of $3,360.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by the same firm, at a pro rata fee of $10,700.

SURVIVAL TRAINING POOL

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Urbahn, Brayton & Burrows & M. T. Pflueger, San Francisco, Calif., and is complete, at a pro rata fee of $3,710.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by the same firm, at a pro rata fee of $17,200.

SERVICE ROAD

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by district public works officer, 12th Naval District, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by the district public works officer, 12th Naval District.

SECURITY FENCING

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by district public works officer, 12th Naval District, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by the district public works officer, 12th Naval District.

SITE IMPROVEMENT

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by district public works officer, 12th Naval District, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by the district public works officer, 12th Naval District.

Admiral CHEW. The next project is the fifth increment for the development of the new Naval Air Station, Lemoore, Calif. It consists of 17 line items in the total amount of $10,818,000. This is to be the master field of a jet complex, similar in mission to Miramar, in southern California, and to Cecil Field, Fla., and Oceana, Va., on the east coast.

The first line item is for taxiways and airfield pavements at the estimated cost of $1,453,000. The field has been designed to support four air groups with certain separate areas and facilities assigned to each group for limited autonomous command, maintenance, and operational purposes. Additional parking apron and taxiways are required. The taxiways are needed for direct connection to the runways, parking areas, and to two guided-missile unloading areas.

The second line item is for construction of a fuel pipeline and land acquisition at the estimated cost of $4,759,000. We estimate that jet fuel consumption will be approximately 8.5 million gallons per month. After consultations with various rail, tanktruck, and commercial pipeline operators and studies of the various economic and other aspects of the problem of supplying this large volume of jet fuel to this remote station, the Navy has concluded that the proposed project is the most effective and economical solution of the problem. The project provides for construction of approximately 90 miles of 6-inch pipeline, pumping stations, acquisition of about 10 acres of land in fee in the terminal area, and of easements over about 86 miles of land to be traversed by the pipeline, and a storage tank of 220,000 barrels capacity. The fuel would be supplied by tanker at Estero Bay where tanker mooring would be provided and the fuel pumped through a submarine pipeline to the terminal receiving tanks on shore, and thence overland to the station.

The third line item is for a photographic building at the estimated cost of $128,000. It is required for much the same reason as I outlined for the Meridian Photo Laboratory. Gunnery training films will be taken, developed, and studied by the pilots shortly after completion of their flights. Timely coverage of crashes and other emergencies, photos of damaged material, equipment, and construction progress are a part of routine requirements. The photographic building is necessary to carry out these various functions.

The fourth line item is for construction of the second increment of the training buildings at the estimated cost of $758,000. This involves the construction of two buildings, one in the administrative area as an addition to the training building authorized previously; and the other in the operations area. Before they are deployed, aircrews must receive ground training through lectures and classroom work and by use of mockups and simulator. The training is of two basic types. The first type is for procedure and proficiency and includes pilot cockpit procedures, air navigation, and weapon systems, and maintenance of various parts of the aircraft and equipments. The other type relates to flight environment and hazards. It covers altitude decompression, ejection seats, night vision techniques, pressure suits, and physiological examinations and reactions. The first type is handled mainly in the administrative area and the second type in the operations area.

The fifth line item is for a guided-missile support facility at the estimated cost of $451,000. This is similar to line items approved by this committee in previous programs. It includes a guided-missile building for check and test of missiles, and parking apron with reveted embankment for loading and unloading aircraft. These facilities are required for air augmentation currently assigned to fleet air squadrons now stationed at Alameda and Moffett Field.

Training flights to the Pacific Missile Range to fire at drones will require loading of live ordnance at this station to fully utilize training time.

The next line item is for ordnance facilities at the estimated cost of $577,000. These facilities are required for construction of magazines and inert storehouse for storage of a number of ordnance items used by the station and air groups in their various operational training exercises.

The seventh line item is for construction of a general warehouse at the estimated cost of $305,000. This building is required for storage of materials used in the normal operation and maintenance of a large air station. Approximately 46,000 square feet of storage space was authorized in a previous program.

The eighth line item is for a flammable storehouse at the estimated cost of $74,000. Because of the hazards involved in the storage and handling of such materials as paints, alcohol, and acids, they must be stored in a specially designed structure apart from the general stores. The proposed building is required for safe storage of these materials.

The ninth line item is for construction of a brig at the estimated cost of $116,000. This will have a 16-man capacity. The brig is needed for confinement of military personnel convicted of various offenses.

The 10th line item is for construction of a commissary at the estimated cost of $291,000. This station, because of its function, has purposely been located in an isolated area. Consequently, unless the proposed commissary store is provided, the approximately 1,300 families which will be residing in the Capehart housing adjacent to the station, will have to travel a minimum distance of 17 miles to Hanford, the nearest community having adequate shopping facilities, to obtain their meats, vegetables, and other foods for day-to-day living.

The 11th line item, Mr. Chairman, is for a commissioned officers' mess (open) at the estimated cost of $585,000. Recreational facilities are required for use by the officers and their families who will be residing at this station. We estimate that these personnel will approximate 3,250 in number. The Navy believes that such facilities are essential for the welfare and morale of the personnel assigned to a relatively remote station. There are no nearby communities where similar facilities are available.

The next line item is for an enlisted men's club at the estimated cost of $612,000. This will provide recreational facilities for the enlisted men and their families at this isolated station. Including the families of the married enlisted men, we figure that approximately 10,400 people will have access to this facility. It is essential that such a large group of people be furnished facilities where they may spend off-duty hours in wholesome recreation and relaxation.

The next line item is similar to the two I have just described, but on a smaller scale. It is for a chief petty officers' mess (open) at the estimated cost of $199,000. This club is required as a recreational facility for the planned number of 476 chief petty officers to be assigned to this station and their families, a total number of about 1,550 people. The "chiefs" have a special status in the Navy, since they

form the leadership and command link between officers and enlisted men. They are deservedly known as the backbone of the Navy for the important part they play in the chain of command.

The 14th line item for the Naval Air Station, Lemoore, is an outdoor survival training pool at the estimated cost of $320,000. It is essential that all military personnel of the station be able to swim and to be able to take care of themselves in water. Most of these personnel will be members of aircraft crews whose duty will take them on overwater missions. The pool will be equipped with the "Gilbert Dunker" and other devices used for survival training and combat techniques, including simulated escapes from downed aircraft and sinking ships.

The 15th line item is for construction of a service road at the estimated cost of $28,000. Original plans called for construction of an incinerator for burning the trash and refuse collected on the station. Subsequent studies showed that the sanitary fill method of refuse disposal is feasible and more economical than incineration. A relatively remote area of the station has been designated as the disposal area. The proposed line item will provide a hard-surfaced road for trucking the refuse from the main parts of the station to the disposal area.

The 16th line item is for erection of security fencing at the estimated cost of $62,000. The area adjacent to this new master jet base is agricultural and cattle land. After the crops have been harvested, livestock are grazed on the stubble. The fencing is required not only to prevent cattle from straying into the flight operations area, endangering aircraft and vehicle operation, but also to prevent aircraft operations from endangering persons who might stray into hazardous areas.

The final Lemoore line item in the program is for site improvement at the estimated cost of $100,000. The hot, dry summers prevalent at this location indicate the need for seeding and planting for erosion control. This work must be done to prevent dust, weed, rodent, fire, and health hazards. Windborne dust carries the fungus spores of the valley fever, coccidioidomycosis. This item will provide for the protective seeding of selected station areas. It will exclude those areas already included as parts of other line items and those outlying areas which will be made available for outlease.

FUEL PIPELINE

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will you tell the committee specifically what you have in mind with reference to the fuel pipeline here?

Admiral CHEW. Mr. Chairman, as you know, we estimate that the fuel consumption for purposes of our computation is about 5 million gallons a month. I think at peak loads it might go to 8.5 million gallons, but for purposes of our study we finalized on a figure of about 5 million gallons a month. After consultations with the various rail, tank truck, and commercial pipeline operators, and studies of the various economic and other aspects of the problems of supplying this large volume of fuel, we concluded that the proposed project is the most effective and economical solution of the problem.

The project provides for the construction of approximately 90 miles of 6-inch pipeline, the pumping stations, acquisition of about 10 acres

of land in fee in the terminal area, and of easements over about 86 miles of land to be traversed by the pipeline, and a storage tank of 220,000 barrels capacity. The fuel would be supplied by tanker to Estero Bay, where tanker mooring would be provided and the fuel pumped through a submarine pipeline to the terminal receiving tanks on shore, and thence over land to the station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Can you assure the committee that this line has been approved by all the reviewing authorities and that it will be constructed in the manner which you have outlined before us?

Admiral CHEW. No, I cannot, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What discrepancies exist that you cannot give us that answer?

Admiral CHEW. In answer, sir, specifically we have been directed to do whichever way is the cheaper to the Government. In other words, we are to get bids and determine for a Navy-built and contract-operated pipeline or a Navy-built and Navy-operated pipeline, on the one hand, for which we would need the authority of the Congress and your approval; and, on the other hand, a privately owned, privately contracted operation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You mean privately constructed?

Admiral CHEW. Privately constructed and privately owned, and contracted to us.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are drawing those two parallels?

Admiral CHEW. We are to draw those two parallels, and then when we have determined which is the most efficient and least expensive to the Government, we are to make the final determination.

However, Mr. Chairman, we have had one difficulty in the fact that until we could at least get options on the land or easements on the land, it would be very difficult to get a contractor to put it out for bids.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Or to construct it yourself.

Admiral CHEW. Or to construct it ourselves.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where are you now? In status quo?

Admiral CHEW. What is the latest status, Mr. Tiencken, regarding the land?

Mr. TIENCKEN. On the real estate we have submitted the real estate project to the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate for approval to go ahead. We have not yet started the negotiations at the field level to procure the options.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Am I to interpret from your statement, Admiral Chew, that both of those potentials have been literally and conclusively surveyed, but we have not determined yet which way we are to go out of those two potentials?

Admiral CHEW. That is correct, sir. May I go off the record a second here?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Surely.

(Off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. When do you believe there will be a determination made here by those who are presently reviewing it? I am not referring to the authorization. We know why that is. I am talking about the economics, the basic fundamentals on which you people are surveying these two potentials. It is my understanding as I see this, you have sent letters out to private operators and asked them to make their presentation within certain limitations. Is that correct?

Admiral CHEW. Have you actually gone out with the letters yet?

Admiral PELTIER. Within the last week we have had another proposal from S.P. in which we asked them on the basis of a 5-year guarantee what their price would be. It is a little bit cheaper than the original price, but on the price we now have the Navy-constructed line is still the cheapest.

In addition to just the Navy operation, we have also taken into account with the S.P. the Air Force requirements at Castle Air Force Base. We have surveyed that. I have a complete presentation that we could go into and give the committee, if you desire it, showing the relative costs. This is by far the cheapest. This thing has probably been engineered finer than any project we have in the program.

(Off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD How much protesting are you going into on a line of that character for electrolysis?

Admiral PELTIER. We will make a cathodic survey, and I am sure we will put cathodic protection on it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But that definitely is going to be done in advance, is it not?

Admiral PELTIER. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That portion of the technique will be applied?

Admiral PELTIER. That is part of the planning. Of course, we have to get actual onsite readings after the thing is in.

Mr. JONAS. Will you yield, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Surely.

Mr JONAS. What is the justification for building a naval air station in a location to which you have to transport your fuel 90 miles?

Admiral CHEW. The biggest justification, Mr. Jonas, is the fact that this is one of the four master jet stations, two on the east coast, two on the west coast. The most important factor is the free airspace for jet operations.

Mr. JONAS. Could you have found free airspace over the ocean? It seems you could have built it nearer the coast.

Admiral CHEW. As I think you remember from last year, we have a field in San Francisco, Moffett Field. We also have one at Alameda. The jet operations in the crowded bay area from Moffett Field are becoming intolerable.

Mr. JONAS. How do you get your fuel to Moffett?

Admiral CHEW. I think we get the fuel to Moffett by pipeline, sir.

Mr. JONAS. By boat?

Admiral CHEW. By tanker, delivered by pipeline, yes, sir, Moffett is right in the bay area.

Mr. JONAS. It is adjacent to the bay.

Admiral CHEW. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. You get your fuel through the bay and then by pipeline on to Moffett Field?

Admiral CHEW. I think they have a very short pipeline.

Mr. HANABURY. That is correct, about a mile and a half, sir.

Mr. JONAS. It is too late to talk about that now, but 90 miles is a very long distance to transport all the fuel you will use at Lemoore from now until the end of time, or as long as that station is there.

Admiral PELTIER. Mr Jonas, you have to transport your fuel regardless of where you are located. It is 90 miles from the ocean in this particular case.

Mr. JONAS. You do not have to transport it 90 miles usually, do you? Have you any other location at which you transport fuel oil that far through pipelines?

Admiral PELTIER. Yes. In Spain we built a 478-mile pipeline. It is the cheapest way to get fuel to a station. It is much cheaper than rail or tank car delivery or truck delivery.

Mr. JONAS. That is all.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is not only much cheaper, but it is also more stable, because any time you are handling truckline operations you are susceptible to highway incidents, wherever they may be. The only way you can have problems here is to have some disturbance which breaks the line, failure of mechanical devices.

I want you to supply for the committee a positive statement from the Secretary of Defense that this line will be constructed in the manner in which you have set forth in these justifications.

Admiral CHEW. Very well, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1960.

Memorandum for the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (material).
Subject: Lemoore pipeline.
Reference: ASD (S. & L.) memorandum dated March 3, 1960.

Reference is hereby modified as follows:
(*a*) This project qualifies as an exception to BOB memorandum 60–2.
(*b*) Construction may proceed on the basis of a Navy owned facility.

PHILLIP LE BOUTILLIER, Jr.,
Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense
(Supply and Logistics).

COST EXPERIENCE ON FACILITY

Mr. SHEPPARD. What has been your cost experience to date on this facility?

Admiral PELTIER. You are referring to the entire station?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is right.

Admiral PELTIER. Our contracting costs are running very close to our actual estimates. I do not have a particular instance here, but as we have been going through our 1960 program our construction costs have been running very close to our estimates.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What work remains to be done after this year's authorization?

Admiral CHEW. There will be a total, Mr. Chairman, of about $4,662,000, which would include such items as chapel, branch exchange, hobby shop, gymnasium, nuclear weapons training facilities, fleet air intelligence support center, air logistic support terminal, aircraft parking apron, a swimming pool for CPO's and one for enlisted men, and site improvement including erosion control measures. I think I have named practically all of them, sir. I left out shed storage and some open storage.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Congress has funded previously a commissioned officers' mess, closed. Why do you need one now which you classify as an open mess?

Admiral CHEW. I think at any air naval station or large naval station there would be a bachelor officers' quarters with a closed mess for those bachelors stationed and living there. The open mess is the

standard word for commissioned officers' club, for recreational facilities. The BOQ is normally not used for that type of thing. In other words, this would be the officers' club, the commissioned officers' mess, open.

GROUP LOAD FOR INSTALLATION

Mr. SHEPPARD. In your present planning, what will be the normal load in terms of numbers of air groups for this installation?

Captain BRIDGES. Three and a half, for a total of about 330 aircraft.

TRAINING BUILDINGS

Mr. SHEPPARD. What other training buildings have been constructed here, gentlemen?

Admiral CHEW. This is the second increment, Mr. Chairman, of the training buildings. One is the administrative area for an addition to a training building authorized previously. The other is in the so-called operations area. Before they are deployed, the aircrews must receive their ground training through the lectures and classroom work, and so on. The training is of two basic types. The first type is for procedure and proficiency, and includes pilot cockpit procedures, air navigation, weapons systems, maintenance of various parts of the aircraft and equipment. That is the operational-type training. The other type relates to flight environment and hazards. It covers altitude decompression, ejection seats, night vision techniques, pressure suits, physiological examinations and reactions.

The first type is handled in the administrative area, and the second type, because of its specific requirement, is handled in the operations area. So you will have two training buildings, one in the administrative area and one in the operations area, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are these the same or different buildings for which you are now requesting $758,000?

Admiral CHEW. These are different buildings. These are an addition. This involved the construction of two buildings, one in the administrative area as an addition to the training building authorized previously, and the other is in the operations area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Last year you showed a total requirement for training buildings of 66,770 square feet, which was the amount funded by the Congress. I notice that this is now increased to 80,774 square feet. What is the reason for this change, gentlemen, in the square feet requirements?

Mr. HANABURY. Mr. Chairman, at the time we listed the total requirement last year, we did not include a requirement for a physiological-training facility, which essentially is orientation of pilots in full-pressure suits for aviating above 50,000 feet. We did not have that in our original concept of the training building, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What caused the change of your thinking? In other words, was the original personnel concept a part of your previous planning, or has this been interjected later? What caused the change?

Mr. HANABURY. Primarily, sir, the success of the Mark IV pressure suit. We have been trying for years to get a good full-pressure suit, and we finally perfected one about a year ago which looks very good. That is the reason we programed in the 1961 program a physiological-

training building, and subsequently during the Department of Defense review we combined it with this second increment of the training building. That would account for the discrepancy over last year's estimate, sir.

SWIMMING POOL, BATHHOUSE, AND SURVIVAL TRAINING POOL

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why do you need a swimming pool and bathhouse for the officers' club and also a survival training pool? Are they so unrelated in their use that it is necessary to have two of them, rather?

Admiral CHEW. A survival training pool, sir, is used specifically and by schedule. Consequently, for recreational facilities it is inconceivable that during the actual survival part of the syllabus other people would be permitted the use of the swimming facilities.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have a swimming pool for the officers. What are you going to do with the enlisted personnel? Are they to use the survival pool? What I am getting at is the breakdown here; at the moment I am not impressed with it. What are the rest of the people going to do out there? If you provide for one, you had better provide for all of them.

Admiral CHEW. Yes, sir. This is one of the items that I read to you, Mr. Chairman—an outdoor swimming pool for the CPO's and also one for the enlisted men. But as an interim measure, possibly the enlisted men could use part of the survival pool after hours. It is not a good idea, and we have never presented that type of program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have a population indicated here of about 4,732 enlisted personnel. I have been in that country, and if you are to provide swimming pools for some you had better take care of the rest of them on some basis.

Admiral CHEW. We have it in the next year's program, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You find this particular place, I presume, in some category where you cannot do it on unappropriated funds, which has been done in various and sundry other places. You cannot do that?

(Off the record.)

ENLISTED POPULATION

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice in computing the size of your enlisted men's club you have included an enlisted population of 5,951. How does this compare with the enlisted population of 4,732 as you show for your proposed personnel load, including those supported at these installations? What has happened to change the mathematics there, please?

Admiral CHEW. Included in the enlisted men's club's actual occupation are the families of the married enlisted men. We actually figure that there will be approximately 10,000 to 10,500 people who would be users of this facility. The real figure of those who would utilize the club facilities runs in the neighborhood of 10,000, sir, with their families.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is indicated from the justifications, and also from your present statement, that your personnel load has changed rather drastically within the last year. Is that a reasonable analysis or not?

Admiral CHEW. The personnel loading has not changed from the groups which Captain Bridges talked about, the three air groups and the replacement group. The facilities for austerity have been reduced to a point where we need them, and this in an austere program would be the biggest we could support.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then let me ask the question this way: Assuming that you have the requirement because of the personnel load factor, looking over your justifications it does not seem to be reflected in the computation of the other buildings and facilities here and in those funded in fiscal year 1960. What would be the answer to that aspect of it, gentlemen?

Admiral CHEW. I would have to provide that for the record.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right. Do so.

(The information requested follows:)

SUPPLEMENTAL RECORD REGARDING NAS LEMOORE

NAS Lemoore was originally conceived to accommodate the equivalent of four air groups as an initial goal. This plan represented the minimum required operational capability. All of the facilities previously planned adhere to this base loading and the Navy planning standards with a few minor exceptions.

The ultimate base loading envisioned the equivalent of six air groups home ported at NAS Lemoore. This contemplated base loading would allow six air groups to be home ported, two of which would be deployed, thus leaving four groups on board at all times.

Operational and logistic support facilities have been planned for only the four air groups that would be on board at any one time. However, inasmuch as the families of all the home-ported units will be living on station or in the vicinity, the Navy is morally obligated to provide community support for these persons.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions?

Mr. JONAS. Apropos of our conversation about this pipeline, how far is the nearest railroad to Lemoore?

Admiral CHEW. The railroad runs right down the valley. I think Hanford is the nearest station.

Mr. JONAS. How far is the nearest railroad line from that area?

Admiral CHEW. It goes right near it, 5 or 10 miles from it. We have a siding into the base.

Mr. JONAS. You say that is not adequate to supply the fuel?

Admiral PELTIER. It is much more expensive, sir.

Mr. JONAS. You are going to spend $5 million building this pipeline. Then you have to maintain and operate it in perpetuity.

Admiral CHEW. This is cheaper than getting it by rail, as our studies have indicated, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And the freight charges will go up on you.

(Off the record.)

Mr. JONAS. That is all.

APRIL 5, 1960.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, gentlemen, the committee will come to order.

NAVAL AIR STATION, MIRAMAR, CALIF.

We shall pick up the next item reflected as Naval Air Station, Miramar.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL AIR STATION	MIRAMAR, CALIFORNIA	1452812
4. NEAREST CITY (For, over 10,000) Distance & Direction	**5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY**	**6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE**	**7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA**
SAN DIEGO, 16 MILES SOUTH	SAN DIEGO	BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS	11TH NAVAL DISTRICT
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
SUPPORT FLEET AIRCRAFT	1943	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

Maintain and operate facilities and provide services and material to support operations of aviation activities and units of the Operating Forces of the Navy and other activities and units, as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	72	619	598	0	4,461	5,750
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	59	649	614	0	5,290	6,612
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	61	730	614	0	4,972*	6,377

NO. OF AIRCRAFT — PRESENT 251 — PLANNED 362 — ULTIMATE 363

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *605 OFF 4,367 EM

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	9,323	6,136,000	41,377,000	47,513,000
2. LEASED	76	(25)	225,000	225,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Excepts Land Rent)		47,738,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				15,499,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				2,019,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				21,715,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				86,971,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)				
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11	
211	JET ENGINE MAINTENANCE SHOP	SF	20,561 (SUBSTANDARD)	53,000	0	53,000	1,233	0	1,233	1,233	179
211	TURBO-JET ENGINE TEST FACILITY	EA	3 (SUBSTANDARD)	2	0	2	663	0	663	663	178
211	AIRCRAFT POWER CHECK FACILITY	SY	750 (SUBSTANDARD)	3,000	0	2,625	142	0	123	123	140
								TOTAL	2,019	2,019	

JET ENGINE MAINTENANCE SHOP

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Wilson & Wilson, engineers, Los Angeles, Calif.

Final plans and specifications are being prepared by Wilson & Wilson, engineers, Los Angeles, Calif., and will be completed August 15, 1960. Fee is being negotiated.

TURBO JET ENGINE TEST FACILITY

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Wilson & Wilson, Los Angeles, Calif., and is complete.

Final plans and specifications are being prepared by Wilson & Wilson, engineers, Los Angeles, Calif., and will be completed August 15, 1960. Fee is being negotiated.

AIRCRAFT POWER CHECK FACILITY

Preliminary engineering was not authorized for this project. Standard plans and specifications were utilized.

Final plans and specifications have been authorize,d and will be in accordance with standard drawings.

Admiral CHEW. The eighth project, consisting of three line items for $2,019,000, is at the Naval Air Station, Miramar, Calif. Like Lemoore, this is a west coast master jet station.

The first line item is for construction of a jet engine maintenance shop at the estimated cost of $1,233,000. Similar facilities have been authorized previously for the other master jet stations. Where jet aircraft operations are of the great magnitude of those carried on at this station, efficiency and economy dictate that the routine maintenance and repair work be done at the base. This eliminates the need to crate and ship the engines to the shop at the industrial-seaport station of this master jet complex, the Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, where more thorough, but in this case, unnecessary, work is done on jet engines. The maintenance and rework to be performed at the proposed shop requires a production line technique. It includes checking of the electrical and hydraulic systems, engine build-ups, hot and cold section inspection and repairs, and internal combustion section repairs.

The second line item is for construction of a turbojet engine test facility at the estimated cost of $663,000. Experience has indicated the need of one complete test cell with control room for each 100 jet aircraft assigned to a station. The station now has only one such adequate test cell. This line item will provide the additional two test cells required. Jet engines which have undergone maintenance and repair rework require checking and testing prior to installation in the airframe. These tests include leak checks, main and emergency starts, r.p.m. settings, acceleration characteristics, thrust vibration, and all the other tests necessary to assure that the engine is in proper working order.

The third line item for Miramar is an aircraft power check facility at the estimated cost of $123,000. This is the third such facility being requested in this program. I have previously outlined the requirement for the other two for the Meridian and Cecil Field stations. Runup tests and adjustments are required on jet engines after each replacement, after prescribed periodic maintenance checks, line maintenance repairs, and frequently in the investigation of pilot discrepancy reports after flight. In order to accomplish full power runups safely, a facility must be provided which will be capable of withstand-

ing high horizontal thrust loadings. The proposed facility will be capable of testing six aircraft simultaneously.

NEED FOR JET ENGINE MAINTENANCE SHOP

Mr. SHEPPARD. With the overhaul and repair facility for aircraft at North Island, which is only a few miles distance from Miramar, why do you need the jet engine maintenance shop which you are requesting here?

Admiral CHEW. Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Hanabury can give you the precise details on this.

Mr. HANABURY. Mr. Chairman, this is what we call a class C jet engine maintenance shop and it is to perform engine repair and engine rework at what you might say organizational level rather than depot level. We have many different types of jet engines in the Navy. North Island is not the overhaul point for all of those jet engines but the object of this shop is to repair a low time engine and get it back into the fleet rapidly rather than crating and shipping it either to North Island or back to the East Coast in some cases to a major overhaul point. There have been cases where we have set up jury rig shops of this type in hangar lean-tos resulting in tremendous savings. In other words, if we have a mulfunction of an engine, say, with 30 hours, when the normal overhaul cycle may be 300 hours, if we can repair that engine locally and get it back into an aircraft, we save on aircraft availability and also reduce the engine pipeline.

COST OF EQUIPMENT

Mr. SHEPPARD. In addition to the construction cost of the shop, what is the cost of the equipment which you are going to have to procure in order to set up the establishment?

Mr. HANABURY. The cost of the equipment is estimated at $221,000, Mr. Chairman, and it consists of cleaning and nondestructive test equipment, engine stands and office-type furniture, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Under the new Navy program for aircraft engine maintenance, what work will be handled at the base level which has not heretofore been handled at the base level which has not heretofore been handled at that level?

Mr. HANABURY. Mr. Chairman, are you referring to the fact that we are eliminating FASRONS in many cases?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is exactly what I am referring to.

Mr. HANABURY. I do not see any great increase in capability other than that we will acquire by the construction of items such as the jet engine maintenance shop, but our overhaul procedures will be pretty much the same. We will have class A, for instance, at North Island and Norfolk; and at our master jet fields, Miramar, Lemoore, we will have what we call class C maintenance. I do not foresee any great change in capability at field level as a result of the elimination of the FASRONS. It is really reorganization to do a job a little better.

Admiral CHEW. I think it is organizational change rather than a functional change, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What additional tooling will be required? I am trying to get the answer to this total project in here if I can and the cost factor aspect of it.

I want to know what this is. I guess your tooling cost will be, for example, designated as a higher engine maintenance facility. That will have to prevail. What goes on top? What improvements do you contemplate might be in evidence, if any?

Mr. HANABURY. I don't see any, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is there going to be any duplication of tooling requirements here?

Mr. HANABURY. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I mean in conflict with North Island or on the same general comparability or level?

Mr. HANABURY. No, sir.

DELAY CAUSED BY REPAIRS TO JET ENGINES AT OTHER STATIONS

Mr. SHEPPARD. What complaints have you had with reference to the quality and delay in shipping repairing or returning jet engines to and from North Island, for example?

Mr. HANABURY. I know of none, sir. I will look into it. If there are any, we will furnish them for the record. I know of none off hand, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would insert in the record at this point a table which will show the down time at Miramar caused by delays in having jet engines repaired at other stations and comment on the extent of the down time and up to as close as the present as you can.

Will you supply that information?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir.

(Information requested follows:)

The aircraft down time at Miramar as a result of sending engines to class A stations would have an unacceptable effect on aircraft availability. The complexity of modern high performance engines has increased. As a result, these engines have been in very short supply. As experience was gained with these engines, an increased maintenance capability was achieved. Even though Miramar repaired 88 engines in a 6-month period, they were unable to gain a ready-for-issue pool. In addition, there was an average of two aircraft out of commission for lack of engines during this time.

Currently statistical information is not available to show how many aircraft would have been down for the lack of an engine if those engines had been repaired at other stations. However, it is reasonable to point out that the repair of these engines at Miramar had a definite effect on aircraft availability, and consequently, has been a determining factor in the overall readiness of tactical squadrons.

Maintaining modern high performance aircraft available for operations has been a problem in the Air Force as well as the Navy. The engine repair program has greatly contributed to increasing operational availability at our master jet bases.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the present schedule at North Island permit handling of additional engine-repair work at Miramar, for example, without falling behind schedule or going into a great deal of overtime?

Mr. HANABURY. Mr. Chairman, that is a difficult question to answer because North Island is not tooled to handle all types of jet engine overhaul and I can look into that and try to furnish an answer for the record but it is apples and oranges because sometimes a station is designated an overhaul point maybe for J–57 and a few others.

TYPE OF ENGINE REPAIR AT NORTH ISLAND

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would insert in the record the type of engine repair that is presently being conducted at North Island on a

comparable basis of that of Miramar that you are projecting here for funding.

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir.

(Information requested follows:)

North Island O. & R. is a class A maintenance activity with the responsibility and capability of overhaul and repair of specified aircraft, engines, and components. This is an industrial type activity in which aeronautical material is restored to original specifications and performance standards.

The jet engine maintenance shop at NAS Miramar will perform complete repair (upkeep) of inservice jet engines. Maintenance consists of replacement and/or repair of internal components of both the hot section and cold (compressor) section of the engine. Replacement of these internal components will permit a greater number of engines to complete the service period (hours between complete overhaul) at the expiration of which they are sent to a class A (O. & R.) activity.

The complete repair jet engine shop at Miramar will provide the facility to repair engines operated by the fleet units at Miramar. The O. & R. at North Island may or may not be designated overhaul point (DOP) for that particular engine model.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would the present scheduling at North Island, permit handling additional engine repair work from Miramar without falling behind the schedule or going into a great deal of overtime, if you know at the present time?

Mr. HANABURY. We do not know, sir. We will have to furnish that for the record.

(Information requested follows:)

North Island O. & R. is organized to do complete overhaul of certain jet engines. To inject engine maintenance that can be performed at Miramar into this operation would result in disruption of the complete overhaul program and would result in many lost hours of engine availability at Miramar. To perform this task by adding shifts to North Island would further increase the cost of accomplishment due to premium paid for night shift work.

POSSIBILITY OF CONTRACTING REPAIRS TO COMMERCIAL FACILITIES

Mr. SHEPPARD. What consideration has been given to doing this work by commercial facilities, especially in the San Diego area?

Mr. HANABURY. This is so integral with fleet operations, Mr. Chairman, that it would be impossible for us, I think, to do this under commercial contract. In other words, this is maintenance for fleet squadrons, I do not believe that we should under those circumstances ever attempt to rely on commercial contract to meet emergency and accelerated Far East deployment schedules of the fleet.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Here is a pretty heavy investment that you are going to go into insofar as your operational requirements are concerned.

I do not quite understand your answer. I do not say it is not a proper one, but you supposedly have out there a series of people who have been in overhaul work and have done it for a lot of other people and turned out satisfactory work on a time schedule. What actual efficiency do you have, insofar as this situation is concerned, that would overshadow that type of function?

I mean, as long as they meet the time schedule.

Mr. HANABURY. Mr. Chairman, I would have to go back to the fact that North Island is a designated overhaul point for certain types of engines.

DISCUSSION OF OVERHAUL REPAIR WORK TO BE PERFORMED AT MIRAMAR

Miramar will perform this class C function on all types of jet engines. Where this will pay dividends, as I said before, is in taking an engine, for instance, which has a bad malfunction at 25 or 30 hours and you get it back fast.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much faster would you get it back? You can write your own time schedule under a contract. You write it on a million other contracts on the time schedule so why couldn't you do it here? You have got an institution in North Island. Have you surveyed the North Island project for expansion on North Island, having two operations instead of one? To sit here and tell this committee that capability to overhaul an engine has got to be in a classified category is stupid, in my book; I won't buy it.

I have seen too much overhaul repair work around the country. If you can clean it up, go ahead and do it.

Mr. HANABURY. May I go into a little explanation of how we do this?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Mr. HANABURY. If I may; you see a shop in the center of the diagram called a class C shop. That is the jet engine maintenance shop that we are talking about. We are planning to construct four of these, sir; one at Oceana, which is just about completed; one at Cecil, one at Lemoore, and one at Miramar.

We have found from experience that the jet engine maintenance space that we provided at our so-called operating or master jet fields is inadequate.

You will note on the Miramar justification sheet it shows 20,000 square feet of existing substandard space. That is the space we originally designed as a class C engine repair facility in that hangar. It cannot do the work. We have engines scattered all over the hangar deck that should be used for maintaining the whole airframe.

To go on back to my diagram, the naval aviationwide program provides for four of these shops. We have a situation, if we go to the right-hand corner where we see a squadron hangar, a squadron of 14 or 16 airplanes is getting ready to deploy, a malfunction on the engine occurs. There may or may not be an engine in the supply department which can be reissued to it because of lack of engines in the pipeline. By taking that engine out of the airframe, checking it on the power-check facility, we may detect a malfunction that is within the capability of the class C shop to correct. We therefore pipe the engine into the class C shop, run it through the turbojet engine test cell and put it back into the end of the building ready for issue storage, or if another engine is available from the supply department, we would get it.

If we do not have this shop, it means that when malfunctions are discovered, instead of going into our class C shop, they must go all the way back through the supply department to our major overhaul point.

We have found from experience at Cecil Field and several other stations that this operation will pay off.

Mr. SHEPPARD. On what premise do you find it pays off?

Mr. HANABURY. If I may go on?

Mr. SHEPPARD. You may.

Mr. HANABURY. During the period January to June 1959, Naval Air Station, Miramar, with just limited facilities, was able to return

7, J–71, 45 J–57, and 36 J–65 engines to operating aircraft rather than to place them in the pipeline to a major overhaul point. Assuming a tolerable turnaround time of 147 days as established in the GAO report to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy of September 30, 1958, this accomplished a saving of 12,936 engine-days, or 310,464 engine-availability-hours and a rough estimate of that is a saving of $704,000.

This is just with limited facilities at Miramar.

I have similar examples at Cecil Field where we estimated we saved in a very short time $248,000 in performing this function in a jury-rig fashion and getting it done.

Mr. SIKES. How would you save that money?

Mr. HANABURY. We would save it in shipping costs, for one, on engines and we would save it——

Mr. SIKES. How much would be the shipping costs?

Mr. HANABURY. We estimate that, for instance, at Miramar, that it would be $8,000 per unit and that includes shipping costs—I do not have a breakdown of it here, Mr. Sikes.

Mr. SIKES. Isn't that an awfully large shipping cost for a unit, $8,000?

Mr. HANABURY. $8,000 is a portion of the overall. The shipping costs would be a portion of the $8,000, sir. I do not have a breakdown.

Admiral CHEW. For the complete overhaul?

Mr. HANABURY. That is correct, sir.

Mr. SIKES. All right.

What else?

Mr. HANABURY. Those are two examples, sir, of where we feel we would get real savings by the construction of this facility.

Mr. SIKES. Will you supply for the record a more complete breakdown of the savings that you anticipate?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir; at all locations.

(The information requested follows:)

NAS MIRAMAR

The following data is based on 6 months' operation (January–June 1959) with existing facilities.

Engines processed	88	
O. & R. repair costs (per engine)	$8,000	
Total		$704,000
Engines processed	88	
Transportation cost (per engine)	$400	
Total		35,200
Total cost if returned to O. & R., North Island		739,200
Engines processed	88	
Repair cost Miramar (parts) (per engine)	$1,000	
Total		88,000
Net savings		651,200

The following data represents costs incurred by returning repairable engines to O. & R. due to lack of facilities to repair at Miramar.

Engines returned	43	
O. & R. repair costs (per engine)	$8,000	
Total		344,000
Engines returned	43	
Transportation cost (round trip)	$400	
Total transportation cost		17,200
Total		361,200

During this 6 month period of time 88 engines were repaired with a net dollar saving of $651,000. Had facilities been available, an additional 43 engines could have been returned to service with a dollar saving of $344,000. Although the dollar saving is significant, it is far more significant that these engines, in short supply, were returned to operating squadrons. This materialy influenced aircraft availability; permitting training schedules and deployments to be met. This summary breakdown for Miramar is almost identical to the engine repair program at Cecil Field and Oceana. The complete jet engine repair program at NAS Lemoore is expected to provide similar results.

Mr. SHEPPARD. For what portion outside the airframe in specific respects are the mobile test cells which are available inadequate?

Mr. HANABURY. Primarily, sir, the degree of instrumentation we can get with the portable cell is not as good as that which we can get with a site constructed cell. Another one is that we cannot work under all conditions with the portable-type cell. Conditions of inclement weather hamper our operations for running them through the cell.

Admiral CHEW. Plus, Mr. Chairman, at some locations portable cells are not feasible because of the noise level outside.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You would obviously consider this geographical area in the so-called weather hazard?

Admiral CHEW. Not necessarily weather hazard. Perhaps noise hazard would be the determining factor.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I can understand the noise hazard. Anything that has to be revved up in that type of engine obviously creates noise but as far as exposure outside is concerned, I would question that very carefully in that particular area.

Right now you are doing a lot of outside work down there. It seems to be going along pretty well.

UTILIZATION OF RUNUP PADS AT MIRAMAR

How many runup pads do you have at Miramar now for use at an aircraft power check facility?

Mr. HANABURY. We have six, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What type schedule have you set up for the use of these pads so that maximum utilization is made of them?

Mr. HANABURY. Sir, we have no schedule set up for them. Such schedules as are set up are set up locally and are used on a "when required" basis. As you know, the base loading at Miramar fluctuates; sometimes 150 aircraft, sometimes 300. It would be almost impossible to schedule the use of them, sir. When needed, they should be available.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, in your production line operations you have high- and low-point requirements, do you not?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There is no way of leveling them off? Those valleys and peaks have to be in there. That is rather obvious; isn't that correct?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What delay is being experienced in aircraft getting use of these pads when they are required? Is there any delay?

Mr. HANABURY. I cannot answer to the effect that there have been any, Mr. Chairman, but the primary justification for these is the capability of the existing pads.

The existing pads do not have the capability to tie down the higher thrust-type aircraft, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have you given consideration to the possibility of modifying the present test pad facilities to increase the tiedown capabilities if and when they are required?

Mr. HANABURY. We have given consideration to it, Mr. Chairman, but the anchors that are now in the ground on these tiedown pads are limited to about 15,000 pounds thrust and when we will be putting an aircraft with two J–79's in it, we will have thrusts in the area of 30,000 pounds and I do not know how we can redesign the anchors without pulling them apart completely.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on the item?

The gentleman on my right.

Mr. SIKES. Yes.

COMPARISON OF FACILITIES AT MIRAMAR AND NORTH ISLAND

What about the facilities that are at North Island? Will you discontinue the use of those?

Mr. HANABURY. No, sir.

Mr. SIKES. How will you get away from the statement which has been made to this committee that there will be duplication of repair functions now down at North Island if you install these at Miramar?

Mr. HANABURY. Mr. Sikes, I cannot see where there will be a duplication.

Mr. SIKES. The statement is made that you have facilities at North Island which are adequate, 19 miles away, and that there is no justification for duplicating those repair overhaul facilities at Miramar.

Mr. HANABURY. North Island, as you know, is a major overhaul point for jet engines.

Mr. SIKES. Isn't that what you propose to do at Miramar?

Mr. HANABURY. No, sir.

Mr. SIKES. What are you going to do at Miramar?

Mr. HANABURY. We are going to do major engine repair. We will repair an engine at 30 hours, 50 hours, 60 hours. When the time comes for 300- or 400-hour engine——

Mr. SIKES. You can repair an engine in a major overhaul shop?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, but even with the completion of these facilities at Miramar we will not really have full class A overhaul capability.

Mr. SIKES. How can that be true when the number is decreasing rather than increasing?

I refer to the number of engines in inventory. You are not going to have as many planes in the future as you have had in the past. How can you say you need more facilities?

Mr. HANABURY. We will need more facilities to just take care of engines, such as J–79's, J–57's.

Mr. SIKES. That is not an answer. If you are going to have fewer engines in the future, and you will if you have fewer planes, why do you need more facilities with which to maintain them?

Mr. HANABURY. If we can maintain the engines and repair the engines when they need it, we need to buy fewer engines.

Mr. SIKES. Why do you need more facilities for fewer engines?

Admiral CHEW. May I inject an answer here, Mr. Sikes? There is already a limited facility that is doing this work now so this proposed shop will be an adequate facility to do this type of repair, which is short of the major overhaul and would obviate the necessity of sending the engine back to the major overhaul facility.

It is being done right now; am I not correct?

Mr. HANABURY. That is correct.

Admiral CHEW. It is being done this minute in a very inadequate fashion.

Mr. SIKES. It is being done at Miramar with facilities you do not consider adequate?

Admiral CHEW. That is right.

Mr. SIKES. You seek to improve those facilities?

Admiral CHEW. Improve those facilities.

Mr. SIKES. And continue doing the same work?

Admiral CHEW. Same type work.

Mr. SIKES. How would you save transportation if you are going to continue doing the work at the same place?

Admiral CHEW. This would be a saving over that if we had to send it back to North Island to the major repair shop.

Mr. SIKES. You just stated you are doing it at Miramar.

Admiral CHEW. I think Mr. Hanabury cited the examples of what would—it is a hypothetical saving; am I not correct there?

Mr. HANABURY. That is correct.

Mr. SIKES. These are not actual savings but hypothetical savings?

Admiral CHEW. This is a hypothetical saving that would accrue only if we didn't.

Mr. SIKES. Where is the work now being done which you propose to do at Miramar?

Admiral CHEW. The work is now being done in a part of the hangar, I believe, which is completed.

Mr. SIKES. At Miramar?

Admiral CHEW. That is right.

CURRENT WORK PLANNED TO BE DONE AT OCEANA AND CECIL

Mr. SIKES. What about Oceana and Cecil? Where is the work being done which you propose to do with new facilities at those stations?

Admiral CHEW. That work is again being done in inadequate facilities. However, a jet engine maintenance shop has been authorized, funded, and is now under construction at each of these two stations.

Mr. SIKES. At the stations or at other stations?

Admiral CHEW. At those particular stations.

Mr. HANABURY. May I amend that to say the work is being done there which is within their capability but because of the fact that this is not in commission yet, they are shipping engines to major overhaul points that would not need to be shipped if we had this facility.

(Additional information follows:)

Currently engines requiring overhaul or beyond repair at Oceana and Cecil are shipped to the following points. The current overhaul costs are as indicated.

Type engine	Overhaul and repair	Cost
J–57–P4A	Norfolk	$19,000
J–57–P8B	do	20,000
J–57–P10	do	14,000
J–65–4–16A	Quonset Point	14,000
J–65–18	do	21,000
J–71	do	25,000
J–48	Cherry Point	10,000

Currently engines requiring overhaul or beyond repair at Miramar are shipped to the following points. The current overhaul costs are as indicated.

Type engine	Overhaul and repair	Cost
J–57–P4A	North Island	$19,000
J–57–P8B	do	20,000
J–57–P10	do	14,000
J–65–4–16A	Alameda	14,000
J–65–18	do	21,000
J–71	North Island	25,000
J–48	Alameda	10,000

The number of engines repaired at the class C maintenance activities is directly dependent on the tempo of flight operations. This, coupled with technical maintenance problems, results in a fluctuating workload. The following data is based on activity reports covering the period of time indicated:

1. Oceana (during January 1 to August 1959):

Type engine:	*Quantity repaired*
J–65	70
J–57	15
Total	85

2. Cecil Field (during January 1 to August 1959):

Type engine:	
J–57	43
J–65	25
J–71	1
Total	69

3. Miramar (during January to June 1959):

Type engine:	
J–71	7
J–65	36
J–57	45
Total	88

Admiral CHEW. This facility is an improved facility which would permit a better degree of repair.

Mr. SIKES. I would like to know where the engines are being repaired which are not being repaired at the bases that I named. I named three. There is another one. What is the other one?

Mr. HANABURY. Lemoore.

Mr. SIKES. You are not at Lemoore yet?

Admiral CHEW. No, sir.

COST OF REPAIR AND OVERHAUL OF ENGINES AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS

Mr. SIKES. Of these three, where are you doing maintenance repair and overhaul on engines and at what cost? I want a breakdown

of the cost. I want to know how many engines are being repaired at each of these three stations. I want to know what engines are being shipped away, where they are being shipped, and what the additional costs are as a result of their being repaired elsewhere.

Admiral CHEW. We will furnish that for the record, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

The engines which are not repaired at Oceana, Cecil, and Miramar are being repaired at the following locations. The average cost of repair is as indicated and is based on 50 percent of the average cost of overhaul.

1. Oceana and Cecil:

Type engine and overhaul and repair:	*Cost*
J–57, Norfolk	$8,000
J–65, Quonset Point	8,000
J–71, Quonset Point	8,000
J–48, Cherry Point	5,000

2. Miramar:

Type engine and overhaul and repair:	
J–57, North Island	8,000
J–65, Alameda	8,000
J–71, North Island	8,000
J–48, Alameda	5,000

The engines which are beyond the capability of repair locally due to the lack of facilities are being sent to the designated overhaul point for repair. The location of the DOP and cost of repair is as indicated in the above data. In addition to the cost of repair, the following transportation rates are added (short haul (Miramar to North Island Island and Oceana to Norfolk)):

Per hundred pounds	$2
Per engine, 1 way	$150
Miles (Miramar to Alameda)	500
Per hundred pounds	$10
Per engine, 1 way	$750
Miles (Cecil to Norfolk)	1,000
Per hundred pounds	$12
Per engine, 1 way	$900
Miles (Cecil to Quonset Point)	1,500
Per hundred pounds	$14
Per engine, 1 way	$1,050

The average weight of a preserved and canned engine is 7,500 pounds.

Mr. SIKES. If these facilities are completed at the three stations that I have identified, will the engine repair work be done for those stations or for those and other stations? Will all the facilities be required for the repair work generated at the respective stations?

Mr. HANABURY. I would say yes.

Mr. SIKES. That means three new sets of facilities.

Mr. HANABURY. Four, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Four new sets of facilities. You mean all of that work is now being done under temporary conditions?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir. That which is not being done under makeshift conditions is being shipped to a class A engine overhaul station like Jacksonville, Norfolk, Quonset, or North Island or Alameda, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the capacity of Alameda?

Mr. HANABURY. In engine overhauls per year?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Mr. HANABURY. I would have to furnish that for the record, sir.

(Information requested follows:)

The engine overhaul capacity at Alameda is about 10 engines per day or 2,500 per year. The capacity is proportional to the complexity of the engines.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you know whether or not you have had any difficulties in getting your work assigned to Alameda on time schedule?

Mr. HANABURY. I do not, offhand, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The record does not show?

Mr. HANABURY. No, sir.

DISADVANTAGES TO CONTINUED USE OF PRESENT FACILITIES

Mr. SIKES. If there should be a decision on the part of the committee not to honor this request, what facilities would you then use? Would you continue to use existing facilities which you are now using?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir.

Admiral CHEW. I think amending that, we would continue to use the existing inadequate facilities, with the consequent possibility of sending engines back when in fact one step further, shall I say, could have been accomplished and thereby saved shipping.

Mr. SIKES. What are the additional serious, crippling disadvantages to using present facilities?

Mr. HANABURY. One reason is the fact that we have engines awaiting repair work on the hangar deck. It takes up hangar deck space which should be used for other normal aircraft maintenance functions.

Mr. SIKES. We have a report here which says in several places that no appreciable delays have been encountered and that the delays which have been encountered resulted from faulty scheduling. Is there any comment on that?

Mr. HANABURY. No, sir; other than in fleet squadrons it is very difficult when you are getting ready for deployment to schedule something.

Mr. SIKES. Are there any other serious disadvantages?

Mr. HANABURY. None that I know of offhand.

Mr. SIKES. I am sure there are some, or you would not have this request in here. I suggest a similar list of them be provided for the record.

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir.

(Information requested follows:)

Disadvantages to using present facilities are as follows:

(1) Inadequate physical space and handling capability for the larger and heavier engines such as J-79.

(2) Each model engine requires a separate inspection and repair area in which peculiar tooling and handling equipment must be available.

(3) The quantity of engines involved requires considerable space for storage, handling and maneuvering room in addition to working space.

(4) During the period January to June 1959, 43 engines had to be returned to O. & R. for processing due to lack of facilities at Miramar. Processing through O. & R., plus transportation of these 43 engines, is estimated to have cost $361,200.

Mr. SIKES. That is all.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Jonas?

Mr. JONAS. You continue to send your engines to North Island for class A and class B overhaul?

Mr. HANABURY. North Island and other points, sir; to the designated overhaul point for that type of engine concerned, sir.

MEANING OF CLASS C WORK

Mr. JONAS. All you want with these facilities is to do your class C repair work?

Mr. HANABURY. That is correct, sir.

Mr. JONAS. And this class C work, would you describe it as being day-to-day repair work, maintenance work on the engines?

Does that class C work require the removal of the engine from the aircraft?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir. A great many are removed every 30 hours.

Mr. JONAS. It approaches the overhauling task, then; does it not?

Mr. HANABURY. We have a series of checks, 30-, 60-, 120-hour checks, and malfunctions which are detected when those checks are being made would be repaired here if this facility has that capability.

Mr. JONAS. Do these checks always involve removing the engine from the aircraft?

Mr. HANABURY. In jet-type aircraft most of the times the answer is "Yes."

I believe you will bear me out on that, Admiral.

Admiral ELLIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. In this first item, the maintenance shop, you do not need that for testing, but only for the repair work?

Mr. HANABURY. That is correct, sir.

QUESTION AS TO INADEQUACY OF FACILITIES AT MIRAMAR

Mr. JONAS. Now you say the facilities at Miramar that you are now using are inadequate. Do you mean that they are not extensive enough, you are overcrowded, or in what respect are they inadequate? They have served up until this time. To what extent and how are they inadequate?

Mr. HANABURY. Taking one at a time, sir, the physical area for moving engines around on dollies to perform repairs on them is insufficient. I mentioned that there was 20,000 square feet total, 10,000 in each of two large hangars we have there. We do not have the physical place to put the engines on dollies while we are working on them and to run them through the various cleaning processes and repair and check processes which they must go through. We do not have the physical space to store them at the end of the shop where we keep our ready-for-issue engines.

Mr. JONAS. The members of the staff who visited Miramar stated that they visited the present facilities on 6 separate days, and on not a single one of those days did they observe any overcrowded conditions in your present repair shop.

Mr. HANABURY. I can only conclude that at the time they were there the base loading for Miramar must have been down, but I do not know that to be a fact, Mr. Jonas.

PERSONNEL

Mr. JONAS. What type of personnel do you now have in the shop-work, civilians or servicemen?

Mr. HANABURY. Servicemen, sir.

Mr. JONAS. You do not employ civilian mechanics to any extent?

Mr. HANABURY. I do not know of any aircraft mechanics being employed at field levels. We do at our class A O. & R.'s.

Mr. JONAS. A class C job requires substantially more knowledge and experience and training to perform than a class D, E, or F job?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. Not quite as much as a class A and class B?

Mr. HANABURY. That is correct, sir.

Mr. JONAS. What period of training would you say is involved in equipping a serviceman to perform class C maintenance work?

Mr. HANABURY. I would say that, depending on his rate, he would have to at least have gone through one of our technical schools at Memphis for a period of, say, 3 to 6 months.

Mr. JONAS. Then would he serve a period of apprenticeship before he is qualified to do this work?

Mr. HANABURY. Within the old FASRON that we had, they would merely be assigned to a FASRON, and I believe his training from then on would be on-the-job training as supplemented by naval air maintenance mobile-training equipment and things of that nature that we move around from station to station to explain the various aircraft.

Mr. JONAS. Would you say it would require from 3 to 6 months to train an enlisted man, qualifying him to do this class C work?

Mr. HANABURY. I would say it would. I will yield to the admiral's good judgment on that.

Admiral ELLIS. I would say it would require at least that much.

Mr. JONAS. And he is serving a 2-year tour?

Admiral ELLIS. In some cases; yes.

Mr. JONAS. So you take pretty nearly a third of his tour to train him before he is qualified to do this work?

Admiral ELLIS. This is true throughout the services, sir, because of our fast turnover.

It is one of our biggest problems.

Mr. JONAS. In that connection, have you considered using commercial repair faciilties for this class C work at San Diego?

Admiral ELLIS. I am not too familiar with this problem, sir, but I know it has been seriously considered.

Mr. JONAS. What would be the difference in cost?

Have you had any class C maintenance work, repair work, performed at commercial fields?

Admiral ELLIS. I would like to furnish that for the record, sir.

I am not familiar with that.

AVAILABILITY OF COMMERCIAL AIRCRAFT-MAINTENANCE ESTABLISHMENTS

Mr. JONAS. My information is that there are three or four aircraft-maintenance establishments in the San Diego area, one of which is working about 20-percent capacity and the other one less than 50 percent, and they are both interested in engine-repair work and are qualified and equipped to do this kind of maintenance work.

I would like to know something about the cost estimates on the use of commercial facilities in comparison with your own cost, particularly since it takes you from 3 to 6 months to train a man to

even qualify him to do this work and you have got this rapid turnover. I would think that in that kind of a situation at least some very serious consideration should be given to utilizing the facilities that are available in the area.

Admiral ELLIS. May we furnish that information for the record?

Mr. JONAS. Yes, sir.

(Information requested follows:)

This level of maintenance is a fleet responsibility and must be performed to support around-the-clock fleet operational requirements. Maintaining this capability is a fleet requirement and directly influences readiness. In view of the operational requirement the cost of equivalent commercial repair has not been determined. In addition, the nature and technical complexity is such that if this work couldn't be responsibly performed commercially the prime engine contractor would be the logical one to provide this support.

METHOD OF SHIPPING ENGINES FROM MIRAMAR TO NORTH ISLAND

Mr. JONAS. How do you ship your engines to North Island from Miramar?

Mr. HANABURY. By railway or truck, sir.

If they were just going from Miramar to North Island they would go by truck.

Mr. JONAS. Whose truck?

Mr. HANABURY. I do not know, sir. Probably just a commercial trucker in the area.

Mr. JONAS. Instead of using your own equipment?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. You do not have the equipment that you can move engines that far?

Mr. HANABURY. We have equipment, sir, but we may have a commercial contractor to do that, sir. I do not know. I can furnish that for the record, sir.

(Information requested follows:)

At the present time the majority of the trucking requirement is being handled by commercial contract. The movement of engines is one of several supply requirements at Miramar. Although Miramar has limited equipment for this purpose, no attempt is made to maintain and operate all trucking equipment required to move aeronautical supplies and engines between Naval activities.

Mr. JONAS. That is all.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, gentlemen, we will pick up the next item.

NAVAL AIR STATION, NORTH ISLAND, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall insert in the record, Mr. Reporter, page 27. This has to do with North Island.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 25 MARCH 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL AIR STATION, NORTH ISLAND	SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA	1452808

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTY/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
CORONADO, 1/2 MILE SOUTHEAST	SAN DIEGO, LOS ANGELES	BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS	11TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
FLEET SUPPORT	1917	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To maintain and operate facilities and provide services and material to support operations of aviation activities and units of the Operating Forces of the Navy and other activities and units, as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	106	1,313	7,011	0	7,119	15,549
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	97	1,528	7,202	0	6,958	15,785
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	96	1,565	7,202	0	7,109	15,972

NO. OF AIRCRAFT — PRESENT 498 — PLANNED 493 — ULTIMATE 580

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *OFF 1,240 - EM 5,869

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	34,067	14,701,000	62,625,000	77,326,000
2. LEASED	8	(16,527) (Excess Land Rent)	244,000	244,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959				77,570,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				19,111,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				244,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				40,812,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				137,737,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY				AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)				
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
152	CARRIER BERTHING WHARF	FB	3,325 (SUBSTANDARD)	3,325	1,212	0	5,000	7,000	0	5,000	69
211	HELICOPTER ROTOR BLADE TEST FACILITY	EA	1	1	0	1	244	0	244	244	70
								TOTAL	244	5,246	

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
NAVDOCKS 2570 (7-58) Supersedes Edition NDO

BOOK NO. X PAGE NO. 27

CARRIER BERTHING FACILITY, INCLUDING LAND ACQUISITION

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Moffatt & Nichol, Inc., Long Beach, Calif., and is complete.

Final plans and specifications for this item have been completed by Moffatt & Nichol, Inc., for a location at Zuniga Point.

Chief of Naval Operations has decided to relocate this facility to the Quay Wall. Final plans and specifications for the Quay Wall site have been authorized and will be completed approximately August 15, 1960.

HELICOPTER ROTOR BLADE TEST FACILITY

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Wilson & Wilson, Los Angeles, Calif., and is complete.

Final plans and specifications are being prepared by Wilson & Wilson engineers, Los Angeles, Calif., and will be completed by August 15, 1960, at a fee of $11,550.

Admiral CHEW. The next project consists of two line items for $5,244,000 at the Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, Calif., As I mentioned previously, this is the industrial-seaport station of the Miramar Master Jet Complex.

The first line item is for carrier berthing wharf, including land acquisition, at the estimated cost of $5 million. This item was authorized in the fiscal year 1959 program by Public Law 85–685 in the amount of $7 million. *Forrestal* class aircraft carriers are now operating in the Pacific. They require shore support from time to time for replenishment of supplies, movement of personnel, inoperative aircraft, and so forth. The carriers can be logistically supported by tankers and supply ships, but only at much greater cost and danger than at wharfside. At present the channel is too shallow and no accessible wharf equipped with adequate utilities is available to accommodate these large modern carriers. The proposed line item will provide for dredging of the harbor channel and turning basin. The dredged material will be deposited to build up land in the bay which will be used by the city.

The second line item is for construction of a helicopter rotor-blade test facility at the estimated cost of $444,000. This station is comparable to the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Fla., where the East Coast counterpart of the proposed facility is in operation. The North Island Station is the overhaul point for all helicopters operating in the Pacific Fleet. This station already has a helicopter rotor-blade test facility capable of whirling the small blades in use on older helicopters. However, a facility is needed for testing rotor blades up to 90 feet in length of the newer, large helicopters. These high-performance aircraft demand accuracy in the balancing and matching of blades for satisfactory operation. The proposed facility will be capable of spinning large-diameter blades at high speeds in either clockwise or counterclockwise direction, with facilities for tracking, measuring of pitch-moment and alinement and recording of characteristics.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What do you use at the present time to test the helicopter rotor blades there?

Admiral CHEW. We have already, sir, a helicopter rotor blade test facility capable of whirling the small blades in use on the older helicopters.

However, this is a new facility needed for testing the rotor blades up to approximately 90 feet in length for the newer and larger heli-

copters, sir. These are higher performance aircraft requiring a better test facility and the proposed facility will be capable of spinning these large-diameter blades at a higher speed and you can do them either in a clockwise or counterclockwise direction. Then they have facilities for measuring the pitch moment and the alinement and for recording the stresses in the blades, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you know, What do the Air Force and Coast Guard use at the present time?

Mr. HANABURY. The Air Force is doing all of its work by contract, commencing fiscal year 1961, sir. The Coast Guard, such overhaul as it does on its own helicopters does it at Elizabeth City on the East Coast.

Mr. SHEPPARD. They do some contracting on the outside, too, do they not, proportionally speaking?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How does the Army handle its problem? Do you know?

Mr. HANABURY. We talked to the Army about this about 2 weeks ago, Mr. Chairman, and they do it all by contract.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the facility as proposed herein be capable of handling the Air Force, Coast Guard, and Army workload, at least in this general area in addition to the Navy workload?

Mr. HANABURY. We have planned the facility, Mr. Chairman, for the Navy workload only based on a 40-hour-week shift. It could accommodate additional workload, but it has not been planned for that. All we anticipate is that if the Army, Air Force, or Coast Guard have an emergency requirement in the West Coast area, we would accommodate them, but we have not planned for it nor have they asked us to plan for it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That presents an interesting situation, gentlemen, because your testimony is to the effect that you can do his work cheaper within your own operation than you can by contract. I am not questioning that. That undoubtedly is true.

If you make that statement, you have undoubtedly researched the condition and you know what you are talking about, but it would seem to me that if that is true for the joint service operation, even though it might cost a little more originally in your structural requirements and your mechanical requirements within the building, we could pick up perhaps an exceptional cost factor with which the Army, Coast Guard, and Navy is presently confronted, if your statement is correct, in the cost factor estimate.

Has that been thought out? Have you had any discussions with Mr. Bryant's office along these lines?

Mr. HANABURY. No, sir, but during the presentation of this program, to the DOD, we were required to make out a commercial and industrial-type facility justification. This was presented to Mr. Bryant's assistants and it was accepted as the logical thing for the Navy to do.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You started originally with a $7 million request for this carrier berthing facility. Last year you were down to $5 million, and now you are down to $4.5 million. Do you consider the present costs are firm costs?

Admiral CHEW. Yes, sir, I do.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is the facility now being requested for $4.5 million the equivalent of the facility originally priced out at $7 million?

Admiral CHEW. The original facility priced out at $7 million, Mr. Chairman, was the location for the new pier at Zuniga Point. This is a more economical method of obtaining two berthing spaces at the present quay wall by dredging. Incidentally, the facilities are all there for the berths. This would be the normal place that the carriers are now berthed. It just will not take the newer type carriers now. In an effort to reduce our expenditures, we now have firm figures at $4.5 million rather than the $7 million for the construction of an entirely new facility out on the point.

I might add, sir, that there were operational considerations, the ability to get underway more quickly, that led us to accept the first or the Zuniga Point location. But under this situation——

Mr. SIKES. How much quicker can you get underway?

Admiral CHEW. Mr. Sikes, I question how much more quickly, because I have long been an advocate of the inner berth because it will accommodate two carriers for less than the price of one. I would say from an operator's point of view, to get a big carrier underway, you know, takes time. In terms of turning it around you could get it underway from the outer berthing, I would estimate, possibly 30 to 45 minutes quicker.

Mr. SIKES. Is there any concern on your part about creating a new concentration of carriers in the area you are discussing?

Admiral CHEW. No, sir; none at all. This is a pier or quay wall at which presently the carriers are berthed. It is simply dredging to provide facilities for the larger carriers.

Admiral PELTIER. Mr. Chairman, the $7 million engineering estimate was an off-the-cuff estimate.

(Off the record.)

Mr. SIKES. The primary purpose for this is to get you away from the concentration which otherwise you would have at Alameda, a very serious concentration. Is that right?

Admiral CHEW. No, sir. The primary purpose of this pier, as with any pier, is to provide logistic support, where a carrier may come in and offload its planes and get provisions, rather than have to barge it by lighter all the way out onto an open roadstead, which, as you know, is what had to be done in the earlier days of the big carriers.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How does the $4.5 million compare with the $3.8 million which was furnished to the committee investigators and this committee last year for this site? What has occurred to cause the increase from the $3.8 million to $4.5 million?

Admiral PELTIER. The $3.8 million is the estimated contract cost. The $4.5 million includes contingencies and administrative costs.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You mean there is administrative expenditure of these funds?

Admiral PELTIER. Contract administration is around 6 percent.

Mr. SHEPPARD. A portion of this work, especially the dredging of the harbor channel and the reclaiming of land from your operations, will result in sizable benefits to the city of San Diego. What steps have been taken to secure their cooperation in this matter and bearing at least a portion of the costs, considering the land improvement, which obviously will be to their benefit because it was waterfront property?

Admiral PELTIER. There has been some discussion with the city of San Diego. This report was made in the last 2 months. It has not been finally decided just where this fill will go. They have offered certain areas for us to place this fill which will save us some costs in pumping distance, which will be a benefit to the Government. It certainly will be a benefit to the city of San Diego, too.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is there any Navy-owned beach land or Government-owned beach land reasonably adjacent to where the dredging is to be done, where you have your own property?

Admiral PELTIER. In our original study of this first location, we did anticipate certain dredging to go near that pier, to increase the area of North Island itself. The feasibility study which the engineers made for this particular projects indicates placing this at other locations. One of them is the city of Coronado, and two sites on the San Diego side.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the estimated land buildup as a result of the dredging, in yards or cubic feet?

Admiral PELTIER. There are about 4 million yards of material to be dredged. We have on our study locations for possibly 6 million yards at four different locations. Where it will actually go is probably a matter of negotiation.

You would have to make an actual study of what you are going to do. No doubt there will be some accretion of land, depending on where you put it. The quantity in cubic yards will amount to so many square yards of surface. It is hard to say how many acres will be built up. It depends, of course, upon the location.

Mr. SHEPPARD. At the moment, that has not been firmed up?

Admiral PELTIER. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. No negotiations have been completed with San Diego from that point of view at the moment?

Admiral PELTIER. It has not been finalized.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is there any possibility of getting any commitments which might reflect to the benefit of this expenditure between now and the time of the markup of this bill?

Admiral PELTIER. May I go off the record a minute?

(Off the record.)

Admiral PELTIER. Going back on the record, Mr. Chairman, the sites which have been offered by the city of San Diego will reduce our dredging costs and certainly there will be benefits accruing to the city of San Diego.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is one cost comparable with the other? Do they reasonably offset each other?

Admiral PELTIER. I think it would be shortsighted on our part to pay additional dredging costs rather than make an improvement to a tax-supported facility.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I do, too, with the reservation that you are not making an improvement away over what you get. If they are comparable with each other, I would say you are absolutely correct.

Admiral PELTIER. From this chart you see, Mr. Chairman, that these are very short pumping sites. Here are two. It is an advantage to us to do this. It is also an advantage to the city of San Diego.

(Off the record.)

Admiral PELTIER. There is always a contingency on dredging. You have to provide for 2 feet of overdredging. I wanted to clear up that point.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This will give you two carrier berthing facilities in this area compared to only one in the previous proposal. Will this meet your needs in this area, at least for the foreseeable future requirements?

Admiral CHEW. At the present time I would say it meets our needs, and I think I would be safe in saying I think it meets our needs for the foreseeable future. I am sure you are thinking of another request at a later date for an additional berth.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is right.

Admiral CHEW. If and when we have all large carriers, as a matter of prudence I am sure it would probably be wise not to have more than two at any one time at the quay wall.

NAVAL AIR STATION, OCEANA, VA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next we shall pick up the Naval Air Station at Oceana, Va.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL AIR STATION	OCEANA, VIRGINIA	1452940

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
NORFOLK, 20 MILES WEST	PRINCESS ANNE	BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS	5TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
FLEET SUPPORT	1943	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

Maintain and operate facilities and provide services and material to support operations of aviation activities and units of the Operating Forces of the Navy and other activities and units, as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	64	641	575	0	3202	4482
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	59	570	575	0	3713	4917
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	60	660	575	0	4087*	5382

NO. OF AIRCRAFT — PRESENT 227 — PLANNED 280 — ULTIMATE 294

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *OFF 495 EM 3592

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	6,581	1,853,000	40,393,000	42,246,000
2. LEASED	292	(241)	10,000	10,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		42,256,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				12,881,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				1,213,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				22,294,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				78,644,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY				AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11	
116	RUNWAY END ZONES AND CRASH STRIPS	SY	0	1,599,635	0	1,599,635	580	0	580	580	13
134	OPTICAL LANDING SYSTEM	EA	1 (SUBSTANDARD)	4	2	2	250	160	90	90	14
211	AIRCRAFT POWER CHECK FACILITY	SY	1,875 (SUBSTANDARD)	2,625	0	1,875	315	0	295	295	181
211	AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE BUILDINGS	SF	14,994 (SUBSTANDARD)	15,680	0	15,680	248	0	248	248	71
711	FAMILY HOUSING-CAPEHART	FA	1,006 (5 SUBSTANDARD)	1,141	-	40	-	-	-	-	
								TOTAL	1,213	1,213	

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DD FORM 1390 (7-58) Superseded Previous Edition

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 28

430

RUNWAY END ZONES AND CRASH STRIPS

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by district public works officer, 5th Naval District, and is complete.
The final plans and specifications have been authorized and will be accomplished by R. Kenneth Weeks, engineer, Norfolk, Va. The fee has not been negotiated.

OPTICAL LAND SYSTEM

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by district public works officer, 5th Naval District, and is complete.
The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by the district public works officer, 5th Naval District.

AIRCRAFT POWER CHECK FACILITY

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Langley & McDonald, Norfolk, Va., at a fee of $2,247.
The final plans and specifications have been authorized and will be accomplished by the same firm. The fee has not been negotiated.

AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE BUILDINGS

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Hayes, Seay, Mattern & Mattern, Norfolk, Va., and is complete at a fee of $1,500.
The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by the same firm at a fee of $9,210.

Admiral CHEW. The 10th project is at the 4th of our master jet stations, the Naval Air Station, Oceana, Va. It consists of four line items for the total amount of $1,213,000.

The first line item is for construction of runway end zones and crash facility at the estimated cost of $580,000. The nature of the terrain in this tidewater area, beyond the ends of the runways, causes excessive damage to aircraft which overrun the pavement. Crash and rescue vehicles going to the aid of the damaged aircraft bog down in the soft soil. End zones and crash strip areas must be cleared and stabilized to minimize injury to personnel and damage to aircraft in aborted takeoffs and to provide a reasonably effective deacceleration area for aircraft overshooting the runway on landing.

The second line item is for an optical landing system at the estimated cost of $90,000. This is similar to the facilities previously discussed for the stations at Meridian and Cecil Field. It will provide for installation of two of these landing aids for use in training pilots for aircraft carrier landings. Proper use of these devices controls the landings and reduces accident rates with attendant saving in equipment costs and injury or death of highly trained personnel.

The third line item is for construction of an aircraft power check facility at the estimated cost of $295,000. This the fourth such facility proposed in this program. It will have the same capacity as the one discussed for Cecil Field, being capable of testing four aircraft simultaneously. The major difference in cost between the two facilities is due to the fact that the Oceana facility requires a tow-way approximately 6,300 feet longer than the tow-way at Cecil Field. The facility will permit the runup tests and adjustments required on jet engines after each replacement, after periodic maintenance checks, line maintenance repairs, and frequently, in the investigation of pilot discrepancy reports after flight. The high power runup testing is the best method for evaluating the jet engines prior to flight.

The final line item is for construction of aircraft maintenance buildings at the estimated cost of $248,000. Line maintenance functions have been carried on at this station in a number of portable, temporary wood shacks. They are inadequate in space for current needs and have deteriorated beyond economical repair. This item will provide for three line maintenance buildings adjacent to the aircraft parking apron and one in the ground handling equipment area to take care of line maintenance functions of the five squadrons assigned to the station. These proposed facilities will permit the squadron personnel to perform adequately the line operation functions essential in the daily preparation of aircraft for flight, including inspection, adjustments, servicing, correction of minor discrepancies, and replacement of minor parts and accessories.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How have you made out so far at this facility without runway end zones and crash strips?

Admiral CHEW. Have you some pictures of this? I think the picture here is by far the best answer to the question.

Mr. SHEPPARD. One picture is worth a good many words.

Admiral CHEW. Yes, sir.

Mr. HANABURY. Mr. Chairman, we have a very high water table at Oceana. I think these pictures will illustrate to you gentlemen what happens when an aircraft goes off the end of the runway down there. We have had considerable damage, and in some cases actual strikes, because of the fact that the soil there has a very low-bearing power and when the aircraft goes into that area with any speed at all, it has a tendency to nose up and turn over.

Mr SHEPPARD. What is creating these conditions down there so they cannot stay on the strip? Is not the strip long enough in the first place?

Mr. HANABURY. Sir, we have three strips 8,000 feet long at Oceana, and one strip in process of being extended to 12,000 feet. We have aborts where the aircraft accelerates down the runway and has a partial flame out, and there are times when the pilot cannot stop on the existing 8,000 feet.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Under like conditions he could not stop anyway, could he?

Mr. HANABURY. No two pilots have the same proficiency, sir. It is the human element.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Should these pictures indicate to me by interpretation that this is end-runway problems or off-runway problems?

Mr. HANABURY. End zone, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All end zone.

Admiral CHEW Off the runway, sir.

Mr. HANABURY. Beyond the pavement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But this is not a side operation?

Admiral CHEW. No, sir. This is at the end.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is strictly an end operation?

Admiral CHEW. The overrun; yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From a couple of these pictures, if you did not know the situation you would think they went off sideways, but that is not it?

Admiral CHEW. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the need for the aircraft power check facility, for example?

Admiral CHEW Do you want to speak to that?

Mr. HANABURY. This is pretty much the same as the one we previously discussed. We have small existing pads down there which do not have the capacity to check our high-thrust engines.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for these aircraft maintenance buildings at the present time, and what will be done with these facilities if the new ones are constructed?

Mr. HANABURY. Mr. Chairman, you are referring to the item on page 28d?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is right.

Mr. HANABURY. Mr. Chairman, we have two large hangars down there for aircraft maintenance and for squadron offices and group offices. It is a design which dates back to about 1950. We did not put enough space in it to perform normal line maintenance functions. This is what you might call class F. In other words, it is the line maintenance for the people to store their gear who run out to the line to make a quick check on an aircraft. We did not provide enough facilities in these two hangars for them. We normally put up quonset huts and things of that nature, and clutter up our apron. This is to right a wrong. It should have been programed several years ago, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Assuming this request is funded, I repeat, what will you do with the facilities you are now using? Inadequate as they may be, what are you going to do with them?

Mr. HANABURY. We will knock them down, sir.

Admiral CHEW. We shall pull them down, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. While we are are on the subject of destruction of facilities, what is the reason you cannot get rid of facilities which you say to the committee you are going to destroy? We go ahead and fund a project, and we go down later and look the place over, and I will say almost endlessly they are still there. What happens to this? Do you have to have some special act of somebody on the Hill or somebody in DOD or somebody at the Secretary level?

Admiral CHEW. As I spoke to this yesterday, Mr. Chairman, we have instituted a program really to get out and use the language which you have used, to have people tear these things down once the other facility has been built. We have a built-in inertia as string-savers that we are trying desperately to eliminate.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is unfortunate that you have been plagued with this situation, because it does not make a good picture at all. It has a tendency to downgrade your operations from the appropriation point of view, to be frank with you.

Admiral CHEW. We are now making every effort to correct it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I want this in the record. I cannot understand the local command concept where they do not do so immediately. You say you are going to correct it.

Admiral CHEW. We are correcting it now, sir.

NAVAL AIR STATION, QUONSET POINT, R.I.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next, we have the Naval Air Station at Quonset Point, R.I.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL AIR STATION, QUONSET POINT	NORTH KINGSTOWN, RHODE ISLAND	1452772
4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	**5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY**	**6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE**	**7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA**
NORTH KINGSTOWN-WITHIN CITY	DUKES, MASS. WASHINGTON, KENT, NEWPORT, R. I.	BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS	1ST NAVAL DISTRICT
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
FLEET SUPPORT	1940	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

Maintain and operate facilities and provide services and material to support operations of aviation activities and units of the Operating Forces of the Navy and other activities and units, as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	108	1,115	3,805	0	3,610	8,638
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	94	1,054	3,839	0	4,354	9,341
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	94	1,077	3,839	0	3,737*	8,747

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT 309	PLANNED 348	ULTIMATE 330

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *OFF 601 EM 3,136

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	2,444	2,553,000	71,043,000	73,596,000
2. LEASED	56	(177)	39,000	39,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		73,635,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				5,752,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				919,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				21,286,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				101,592,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY				AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11
124	MODIFICATION TO AIRCRAFT FUEL FACILITY	NA	-	-	-	-	674	0	674	674
133	MEDIUM RANGE RADAR FACILITY	SF	1,000 (SUBSTANDARD)	2,600	0	2,600	245	0	245	245
								TOTAL	919	919

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DD FORM 1570 (7-58) Supersedes Previous Edition

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 29

434

MODIFICATION TO AIRCRAFT FUEL FACILITY

The preliminary engineering report was prepared by Jenks & Ballou of Providence, R.I., and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and the same firm will prepare them. The amount of fee has not been reported by the District Public Works Officer.

MEDIUM-RANGE RADAR FACILITY

The preliminary engineering report was prepared by the District Public Works Office, First Naval District personnel.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and will be prepared in the District Public Works Office, First Naval District.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have two line items here. You might make a brief statement on this requirement, if you will, please.

Admiral CHEW. The first line item, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Admiral CHEW. That is for the modification of an aircraft fuel facility at an estimated cost of $674,000. This is another "safety" item—if you remember, I spoke of safety items earlier—similar in purpose to the line item proposed for the Naval Air Station at Alameda. The purpose of the modification is to exclude jet fuel from the water-displacement or aqua system which is now in use. This is essential for control of the quality of jet fuel, since jet fuel has a specific gravity near that of water, and certain of its components are soluble in water. The construction will provide two pumping stations, above and underground fuel pipelines of several sizes, and other necessary features. This is essentially a modification.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How about your range radar facility?

Admiral CHEW. This is a medium-range radar facility, and the item is urgently required to provide flight safety control for the increased number of high-speed aircraft in the crowded airspace. The construction will include a building for housing improved, dual medium-range radar equipment, a new antenna tower and radome with the necessary power and connecting roads. The radome must be remote from the control tower for peak efficiency and so that the radome's large size will not obstruct the view of the tower traffic control personnel.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that going into Quonset Point in the winter, I would always prefer to have the latest improved type of radar to get me in.

MARINE CORPS AIR STATIONS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we turn our attention to Marine Corps Air Stations.

The summary table will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The table follows:)

Weapons facilities, Marine Corps air stations, inside the United States

Installation and line item	Proposed funding	Fiscal year authorization
Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, S.C., taxiways	$272,000	1961
Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N.C.:		
Replacement of aircraft parking apron	316,000	1961
Extension of utility lines	1,295,000	1961
Total	1,611,000	
Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, Calif., relocation of power lines and road	558,000	1961
Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Hawaii, modification to aircraft fuel facility	397,000	1961
Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Ariz., classified item	273,000	1961
Total weapons facilities—Marine Corps Air Stations:		
Unclassified items	2,838,000	
Classified item	273,000	
Total	3,111,000	

MARINE CORPS AUXILIARY AIR STATION, BEAUFORT, S.C.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The first station is the Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station at Beaufort, S.C.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
MARINE CORPS AUXILIARY AIR STATION	BEAUFORT, SOUTH CAROLINA	8149200

4. NEAREST CITY (For. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
SAVANNAH, GEORGIA, 46 MILES SOUTHWEST	BEAUFORT	BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS	6TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
OPERATION OF MARINE AIR UNITS	1942	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

Maintain and operate facilities and provide services and material to support operations of aviation activities and units of the operating force of the Navy and other activities and units, as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations.

Major Tasks:

(1) Support Air Fleet Marine Force Atlantic Units

Major Activities Supported:

(1) Headquarters Commanding Officer, MCAAS, Beaufort
(2) One Marine Aircraft Group (Reinforced)
(3) Two Marine Air Control Squadrons

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	319	2,367	225	0	0	2,911
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	360	2,547	375	0	0	3,282
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	360	2,547	375	0	0	3,282

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	PLANNED	ULTIMATE
	110	90	90

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	6,952	1,556,000	24,450,000	26,006,000
2. LEASED	-	-	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		26,006,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				22,168,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				272,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				9,362,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				57,808,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
112	TAXIWAYS	SY	183,024	19,458	0	19,458	272	0	272	272

173

437

No preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared due to the late date it was finally included in the program.

Final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being prepared by the district public works officer, 6th Naval District.

I am very familiar with this operation, and I have no questions.

MARINE CORPS AIR STATION, CHERRY POINT, N.C.

Now we shall pick up the Marine Corps Air Station at Cherry Point, N.C.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
MARINE CORPS AIR STATION, CHERRY POINT	HAVELOCK, NORTH CARCLINA	8139080
4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	**5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY**	**6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE**	**7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA**
NEW BERN, N. C., 19 MILES NORTHWEST	CRAVEN	BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS	5TH NAVAL DISTRICT
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
SUPPORT AIR FLEET MARINE FORCE	1942	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To maintain and operate facilities and provide services and materials to support operations of aviation activities and units of the Operating Forces of the Navy and other activities and units, as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations.

a. Major Tasks:
(1) Support Air Fleet Marine Force Atlantic Units
(2) Support the Overhaul and Repair Program
(3) Serve as a primary aviation supply point
(4) Provide supply, fiscal, administrative and maintenance functions for assigned activities.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	859	7,298	3,128	0	0	11,285
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	1,114	8,173	3,186	0	0	12,473
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	1,094	7,764	3,186	0	102*	12,146

NO. OF AIRCRAFT — PRESENT 324 — PLANNED 320 — ULTIMATE 317

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *OFF - 44 EM - 58

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	27,168	460,000	84,481,000	84,941,000
2. LEASED	955	(2,500)	48,000	48,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Cost)		84,989,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				7,900,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				1,611,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				30,364,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				124,864,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY				AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11
113	REPLACEMENT OF AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON	SY	302,000 (25,400 SUBSTANDARD)	25,400	0	25,400	316	0	316	316
801	EXTENSION OF UTILITY LINES	NA	-	-	-	-	1,243	0	1,295	1,295
								TOTAL	1,611	1,611

125
180

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DAVDOCES 2570 (7-58) Superseded FonDoes 4080

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 31

(See notes on following page.)

439

REPLACEMENT OF AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by the district public works officer, 5th Naval District and is complete.

Final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being prepared by the district public works officer, 5th Naval District. There are no architect-engineer fees involved in this line item.

EXTENSION OF UTILITY LINES

The preliminary engineering report for this item is being prepared by William C. Olsen & Associates, Raleigh, N.C., at a fee of $10,000 and has not been completed.

Final plans and specifications will be authorized after the Bureau has reviewed the preliminary engineering report.

Admiral CHEW. The second project, consisting of two line items for a total of $1,611,000, is at the Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N.C. This is the major east coast Marine Corps air station, and is comparable, in many respects, to a Navy master jet station.

The first line item is for replacement of aircraft parking apron at the estimated cost of $316,000. The existing parking apron for the planned aircraft loading is acceptable insofar as area alone is concerned. However, approximately 25,400 square yards of the existing 302,000 square yards of apron, is flexible pavement which has become badly deteriorated. It is needed for parking 22 tactical jet fighter and 1 transport aircraft. The high temperature of jet blasts has disintegrated the pavement with the result that loose pavement particles are sucked into the engines. This damages the engines and may cause plane crashes and loss of life. The proposed line item will provide for replacement of the deteriorated flexable pavement with rigid pavement.

The second line item is for extension of utility lines at the estimated cost of $1,295,000. This item is urgently required to provide utilities to buildings recently completed or now under construction. Buildings in the overhaul and repair, Navy supply, and public works areas are dependent on this item to meet their steam requirements for heat and industrial functions. The mains supplying the family housing and bachelor officers' quarters areas of the station have become so saturated by new lateral feeders that the fire protection, telephone, and electric services have become inadequate. Voltage fluctuation now disrupts the operation of navigational aids and operations facilities. Extension of the various utility lines as proposed under this line item, will correct the serious deficiencies.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Give the committee a brief explanation of the requirement for the extension of these utility lines, explaining why they have not been extended up until now and whether or not this will complete any required expansion of the utility systems.

Admiral CHEW. This item, sir, is urgently required to provide the utilities to buildings recently completed or now under construction. The buildings in the overhaul, repair, Navy supply, and public works areas are dependent on this item to meet steam requirements for heat and industrial functions. The mains supplying the family housing and bachelor officers' quarters areas of the station have become so saturated by new lateral feeders that the fire protection, telephone, and electric services have become inadequate. Voltage fluctuation now disrupts the operation of navigational aids and operations facili-

ties. Extension of the utility lines as proposed under this line item will correct the serious deficiencies.

In answer specifically, this will be the completion of the utilities item.

In answer to the question of why it was not done before, I would say that, again in relation to other requirements, you sometimes do not put the utilities in as the structures are built. This situation has also occurred, for example, at Miramar, where we have a considerable utility problem.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, Admiral Peltier, let me ask you this question. I feel that when you put a plant into operation in its original concept, at that time, all the utilities which will be needed to have that particular plant function to its complete capacity should be put in, right at the inception, instead of having to go back and do another job on it. What is your thinking from a structural engineer's point of view?

Admiral PELTIER. With a station like Lemoore, you can size your waterlines and your electric lines to probably the ultimate load. However, at some of the stations like Cherry Point, which were built during the war, we have in some cases tied onto existing feeders, existing waterlines. We get to the point that we have overloaded those and we have to bring them up to the proper size and standard. This is what is happening here at this location.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have all the negotiations necessary for the relocation of these powerlines been approved?

Admiral CHEW. Mr. Chairman, this relocation is on the station.

MARINE CORPS AIR STATION, EL TORO, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next, we have the Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
MARINE CORPS AIR STATION, EL TORO	SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA	8139875

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
SANTA ANA, 10 MILES NORTHWEST	ORANGE, SAN DIEGO	BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS	11TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
SUPPORT AIR FLEET MARINE FORCE	1943	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

Maintain and operate facilities and provide services and materials to support operations of aviation activities and units of the operating forces of the Navy and other activities and units, as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations.

a. Major Tasks:

(1) Support Air Fleet Marine Force Pacific Units
(2) Serve as primary aviation supply point
(3) Provide supply, fiscal administrative and maintenance functions for assigned satellite fields
(4) Provide depot maintenance for motor transport vehicles.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	998	6,417	954	0	0	8,369
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	995	6,864	911	0	0	8,770
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	1,106	7,416	911	0	0	9,433
NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT 225		PLANNED 243		ULTIMATE 209	

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	4,226	1,819,000	54,110,000	55,929,000
2. LEASED	27	(2)	2,000	2,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		55,931,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				10,031,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				558,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				17,673,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				84,193,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11
939	RELOCATION OF POWER LINES AND ROAD	NA	-	-	-	-	558	.0	558	558

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DD FORM 1570 (7-60) Supersedes Previous Edition

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 32

442

8

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by the district public works officer, 11th Naval District, and is complete.

Final plans and specifications have been authorized and will be prepared by the district public works officer, 11th Naval District, for the road relocation.

Plans and specifications for the powerline relocation will be prepared by the Southern California Edison Co.

Admiral CHEW. The third project is at the Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, Calif., for relocation of powerlines and road at the estimated cost of $558,000. This is the west coast counterpart of the Cherry Point Station. The main runway, from which 75 percent of the airfield operations are conducted, has been lengthened in recent years to accommodate the modern, high-performance jet aircraft assigned to the station. Powerlines traverse an area dangerously close to the southeasterly end of this runway. The powerlines and a station road are also close to the westerly end of the other main runway of the station. The powerlines seriously jeopardize pilots engaged in flight operations and have been directly involved in several major aircraft accidents. The road involved is about 1,200 feet from the end of the runway. It has been crossed many times by overrunning aircraft, endangering lives and property. The proposed relocation of the facilities will eliminate these dangers.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I repeat the same question: Have all of the negotiations necessary for the relocation of these powerlines been approved by those concerned?

Admiral CHEW. The negotiations on El Toro have been entered into but they are not complete. We have started negotiations, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is there a possibility that when these negotiations are consummated you might have a shift in your funding requirements?

Admiral PELTIER. No, Mr. Chairman. We have a firm price from Southern California Edison on this. The reason they are doing this, Mr. Chairman, is that there is a lot of salvage material which they will use. If we do this by standard construction contract, we have no way of recapturing this salvage material which we have use for. This is the most expeditious and probably the cheapest way for us to do the job.

MARINE CORPS AIR STATION, KANEOHE BAY, HAWAII

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next, we turn to the "Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii."

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
MARINE CORPS AIR STATION	KANEOHE BAY, OAHU, HAWAII	8139700
4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	**5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY**	**6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE**	**7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA**
HONOLULU, 16 MILES SOUTH	HONOLULU	BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS	14TH NAVAL DISTRICT
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
SUPPORT OF 1ST MARINE BRIGADE FLEET FORCES OF PACIFIC	1941	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

Maintain and operate facilities and provide services and materials to support operations of aviation activities and units of the Operating Forces of the Navy and other activities and units, as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	415	2,277	549	0	5,762	9,003
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	346	2,371	518	0	5,762	8,997
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	418	2,684	518	0	5,762*	9,382
NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT 103		PLANNED 99		ULTIMATE 100	

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *OFF 280 EM 5,482

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	2,975	2,883,000	52,556,000	55,439,000
2. LEASED	-	(-)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		55,439,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				568,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				397,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				9,160,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				65,564,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11
124	MODIFICATION TO AIRCRAFT FUEL FACILITY	QA	2,400,000 (SUBSTANDARD)	2,194,000	0	2,268,000	397	0	397	397

12.

444

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
NAVDOCKS 2870 (7-56) Supersedes Revision 4080

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 33

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Indenco Engineers, Inc., Honolulu, and is complete at a fee of $6,532.

Final plans and specifications have been authorized and the selection of an architect-engineer firm is in progress.

Admiral CHEW. The final unclassified project in this group is at the Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Hawaii, for modification to aircraft fuel facility at the estimated cost of $397,000. This line item is required as a safety of flight measure, the same purpose as the two items I previously described for the Naval Air Stations at Alameda and Quonset Point. It will provide for changing the jet fuel storage from the existing aqua system to a pumped system, to eliminate the danger of dispensing jet fuel with water in suspension. The existing tanks, installed in 1941, have become so corroded that their further usefulness has been impaired. Therefore, in addition to the installation of pumping station, above and underground fuel pipelines, this line item will also include construction of 2 tanks, each of 27,000 barrels capacity, to replace the existing corroded tanks.

SPECIAL PURPOSE STATIONS

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next area of projects is the special purpose stations.

Please place the summary sheet in the record at this point.

(The summary follows:)

Weapons facilities, special purpose stations, inside the United States

Installation and line item	Proposed funding	Fiscal year authorization
Naval Air Development Center, Johnsville, Pa.: Inertial guidance test facility	$1,334,000	1961
Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Md.: Heating plant high temperature water system	2,116,000	1961
Naval Missile Center, Point Mugu, Calif.:		
Improvement of runway overrun area	264,000	1961
Automotive maintenance facility	330,000	1960
Barracks	971,000	1960
Improvement to electric distribution system (San Nicolas Island area)	74,000	1961
Total	1,639,000	
Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, Calif.: Classified items	*4,711,000	1961
Polaris facilities, classified locations:		
Classified item, location A	*500,000	1961
Classified item, location B	*700,000	1961
Total	1,200,000	
Total, weapons facilities, special purpose stations:		
Unclassified items	5,089,000	
Classified items	5,911,000	
Total	11,000,000	

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL AIR DEVELOPMENT CENTER	JOHNSVILLE, PENNSYLVANIA	1303-500
4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	**5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY**	**6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE**	**7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA**
PHILADELPHIA, 17 MILES SOUTH	BUCKS COUNTY	BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS	4TH NAVAL DISTRICT
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	1944	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To conduct research, design, development, test and evaluation of aeronautical systems and components and perform research and development in aviation medicine.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	81	446	1650	0	5*	2182
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	76	394	1650	0	3*	2123
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	76	394	1650	0	3*	2123

NO. OF AIRCRAFT — PRESENT 31 — PLANNED 28 — ULTIMATE 35

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *OFFICERS NARDAC

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	751	708,000	15,689,000	16,397,000
2. LEASED	81	(-)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Zone)		16,397,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				156,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				1,334,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				24,001,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				41,888,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE - 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11
310	INERTIAL GUIDANCE TEST FACILTY	SF	0	20,000	0	20,000	1,334	0	1,334	1,334

176

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DAVDOCKS 1870 (7-58) Supersedes DocQuest 4090

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 34

446

NAVAL AIR DEVELOPMENT CENTER, JOHNSVILLE, PA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The first project under this category is the Naval Air Development Center, Johnsville, Pa.

What other facilities exist within industry and the Government capable of doing this type of work?

Admiral CHEW. Although commercial facilities of similar type are available, Mr. Chairman, they are not capable of testing to the degree of accuracy required. I might add, this particular location is well adapted to the construction of such an inertial guidance test facility because it is in bedrock where you have no vibrations, and so on.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the status of plans for this facility and the equipment to be located there?

Admiral PELTIER. Mr. Chairman, the preliminary engineering has been accomplished by Kearfott Co. of Clifton, N.J., and final plans and specifications have been authorized and the district is now in process of selecting the contractor.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on this item?

Mr. SIKES. No questions.

Mr. JONAS. This will be strictly a Navy test facility? Will the results be available to the other services? Do the other services have similar test facilities?

Admiral CHEW. Mr. Hanabury?

Mr. HANABURY. This will be a Navy facility, but other services will be able to use it on a time-available basis. In specific answer to your question, the Air Force has a facility at Holloman Air Force Base. It is now operational, and it is planned as a fairly elaborate facility. But the Air Force is not planning anything at its Holloman facilities which would accommodate our requirements, sir.

Mr. JONAS. Why would it not be more economical to have an interservice inertial-guidance test facility instead of duplicating facilities among the services?

Mr. HANABURY. The primary reason for that, Mr. Jonas, is the backlog of the workload for a research facility of this type. Each service has usually a tremendous amount of workload to put into it, and many programs would slide many months if we could not get time at the facility or, vice versa, if it were our facility and they could not get time in ours.

Mr. JONAS. How many facilities of this type does the Navy now have?

Mr. HANABURY. Really none of this capability. We have a very small facility at the naval ordnance test station at China Lake, and we have a small one at Point Mugu and a small one at the New York Naval Shipyard under the management control of the Chief of the Bureau of Ships. These are all small facilities, and none have the capability which we are asking for here.

Mr. JONAS. Would it be better to locate these facilities near a missile launching site?

Mr. HANABURY. Not necessarily, sir. The type of people we have for these are truly scientists. If we can build the facility in an area where we can attract top-flight scientists, I think it is a good location for it. The data can be transmitted to the missile site very easily.

Mr. JONAS. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SIKES. Has any consideration been given to consolidating this work with the Air Force facility in Ohio which does substantially the same type of operation?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir; that was done during the course of the Secretary of Defense hearings on this project, where all defense facilities were analyzed.

Mr. SIKES. What was his decision?

Mr. HANABURY. The decision was that the Navy should go ahead and build this facility at Johnsville, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Why?

Mr. HANABURY. Because the Navy has programs which require evaluation by the Navy.

Mr. SIKES. The staff investigators' report indicates that you may be testing the same equipment by the same manufacturer at the same time at both facilities. Why should not the Navy move in and operate jointly with the Air Force and use the same facilities?

Admiral CHEW. I think it is primarily a question of capacity, Mr. Sikes. At the present time, the capacity is not available.

Mr. SIKES. Could you not create additional capacity cheaper than you could build a new facility?

Admiral CHEW. I would say you probably could, sir.

Mr. SIKES. What else did you want to say, Mr. Hanabury?

Mr. HANABURY. I was just saying that one of our big efforts is in the ASW area. We need inertial-guidance tests and inertial-guidance checkout in the ASW area?

Mr. SIKES. You certainly do. There is no question about that. We want you to have it.

Mr. HANABURY. Right.

Mr. SIKES. The question is whether these facilities, both of which are new, cannot be expanded at one place and have a joint operation, part of the joint operation to be conducted by the respective service in the area in which it is most interested. In that way you would assure a closer coordination to avoid as much duplication as possible. Have you really tried to do that, or have you just tried to find reasons why you should not do it?

Mr. HANABURY. From the hearings before the Department of Defense on this one, Mr. Sikes, everything indicated that everybody had facilities for testing components of various inertial-guidance systems, but the capability to test a whole system, nobody seemed to have.

Mr. SIKES. My point is that the Air Force is planning to put up a facility to do this, and the Navy is planning to construct a facility to do this. Why not one facility under joint operation?

Mr. HANABURY. I have a specific statement here that the Holloman facility does not plan to provide the physical facilities, test equipment, or personnel to meet the Navy's requirements, particularly problems of shipboard alinement. It is just not being built into their facility, sir.

Mr. SIKES. I am talking about the maintenance annex, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, which is to be the Air Force operation comparable to the Navy operation in the same field. Holloman is not to do this work. It is going to be this new facility. I wonder if you have really carefully explored the possibility of having the Air Force join you in a joint operation or you join the Air Force

in a joint operation. It would not make any difference, as long as you were able to achieve the same results and would save some money and possibly save duplication of personnel. You do see the advantage of that if it is feasible; do you not?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Why do you not get us a little more information about how carefully you have explored that, for the record.

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

ADDITIONAL JUSTIFICATION FOR THE INERTIAL GUIDANCE TEST FACILITY AT NADC JOHNSVILLE

1. The inertial guidance test facility is designed to give the Navy an adequate capability for the evaluation of inertial navigation equipment now being purchased. The value of equipment now on order exceeds $60 million and will slowly rise from this point on.

2. Commercial facilities cannot accomplish the work planned for a facility of this nature. ——— but 10 times as sensitive. Equipments cannot be tested unless the test equipment is in order of magnitude more sensitive than the equipment. The commercial aspects of this line item have been investigated. In addition to the technical inadequacy of commercial facilities, commercial sources are inadequate because:

(*a*) A commercial source will not make an unbiased measure of the performance of a competitors equipment.

(*b*) Because of proprietary rights one company does not want a competitor to evaluate its products.

(*c*) The contractors have the minimum of equipment to meet their developmental requirements, and in most cases are not set up to test equipment other than their own.

3. The Navy, and the Navy only, has the unique requirement of developing methods of alinement of inertial navigation equipment aboard aircraft carriers at sea and to determine the parameters of inertial components that effect the successful alinement (a tremendous problem area) and operation of inertial components from a moving base. A misalinement of a few minutes of arc of the inertial components in an aircraft from the local vertical (an imaginary line extending from the aircraft through the center of the earth) would give an average error of miles. The antisubmarine warfare problem cannot tolerate errors of that magnitude. The Air Force operates from fixed bases, and is not concerned with this problem.

4. The Air Force facility at Holloman AFB when completed, over the next few years, will be a test facility for Air Force inertial guidance equipments. The capabilities of this facility will greatly aid the Navy's effort in correcting deficiencies in overall systems and the Navy will depend quite heavily on the Air Force facility for developing standards for testing. No two contractors today use the same standards for testing. The developments of Holloman will be utilized in this proposed facility. However, the Navy requirements differ from those of the Air Force. Only the Navy would be interested in the problem of aligning an inertial system in preparation for a mission in an aircraft which has been aboard an aircraft carrier underway at sea for long periods of time. This is strictly a Navy problem, and the Air Force could not provide the tremendous effort required in this area, especially since the Navy's testing would be scheduled on a noninterference basis with Air Force projects.

In addition, the Air Force has established a standards calibration laboratory at the Heath Annex, Newark, Ohio, Gentile Air Force Base at the Dayton Air Force Station. This facility will be used to periodically calibrate test equipment, test jigs and test fixtures that are used at a missile launching site, prior to launch, to check out a missile guidance system. The Navy intends to use this facility for the calibration of the maintenance and overhaul equipment of the Navy's three inertial guidance overhaul facilities. These three overhaul facilities are planned at existing overhaul and repair activities and will be able to utilize, without any additional construction, the physical facilities now inhouse. One task, in addition to the many other tasks of these activities in the periodic overhaul and refurbishing of operational fleet equipment. This overhauled equipment has been previously designed, developed, tested and proven satis-

factory for fleet use. The proposed facility at NADC Johnsville will be used primarily in the design, developing, testing and the integration of inertial guidance equipment into weapons systems. The integration of an inertial guidance system into a weapons system depends on a knowledge of all the equipments comprising a weapons system. Consequently, the engineers working on inertial guidance systems must continually work with not only the experts of the other systems, but must have a fundamental knowledge of these systems as well. It is essential that the inertial personnel and inertial test facilities be physically located with the Navy's other developmental areas at NADC Johnsville. Since the Heath Annex of the Dayton Air Force Station is a limited facility for standards calibration, is remotely located from the Navy's systems developmental facilities at Johnsville, does not provide the flexibility or the facilities for research, development, test and evaluation, it cannot be utilized in place of a facility at NADC Johnsville.

5. The Navy's inertial know-how is largely concentrated at NADC Johnsville. This experience has been gained over a period of 10 to 15 years in the testing of components with limited test equipment. Advances in inertial components, within the last few years, has rendered this limited test equipment inadequate to meet future testing requirements. It is therefore imperative that the Navy provide the equipment and facility to develop the experience and knowledge within the Navy to cope with the problems that will arise with the introduction of inertial navigation equipment in the fleet. This knowledge and experience can only be gained by extensively testing and possible modifying the systems prior to introduction in the fleet. Only with this testing experience will it be possible for Navy personnel to analyze and isolate problem areas resulting from fleet use. The inability to solve these problems would seriously impair the operational capabilities of Naval aircraft. The inertial guidance test facility proposed by the Navy will supplement the facility at Holloman; there will be no unnecessary duplication.

6. In order for the Navy to perform its designated mission, particularly in antisubmarine warfare, it is essential that the Navy have the capability to design, develop, test and improve inertial guidance components and systems and to conduct evaluation flights of these systems. The compatibility of carrier-based aircraft with inertial guidance systems must be evaluated by the Navy. When trouble develops, the Navy must be capable of determining what component causes the trouble, and why that component fails to function properly so that corrective action can be taken. This proposed facility is a Navy requirement and can only be performed within the Navy.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice as we look over your engineering design prospectus there are variables. What is the premise on which those cost factors are based? Is it indicative of a percentage of "X" dollars?

Admiral PELTIER. It depends a lot on the type of facility you are working with. The one I am looking at, the Patuxent facility, is a little more complex. They generally run from ¾ to 1¼ percent for preliminary engineering.

NAVAL AIR STATION, PATUXENT RIVER, MD.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next is the Naval Air Station, Patuxent, Md.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL AIR STATION	PATUXENT RIVER, MARYLAND	1452-712

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, D.C. - 65 MILES NW	ST. MARY'S	BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS	POTOMAC RIVER NAVAL COMMAND

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
TEST ACTIVITY	1943	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

NAVAL AIR STATION

Maintain and operate facilities and provide services and material to support operations of the Naval Air Test Center and other activities and units, as designated by the Chief of the Naval Operations.

NAVAL AIR TEST CENTER

To conduct tests and evaluation of aircraft and their components.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	325	3,655	2,070	0	2,677	8,727
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	284	3,026	2,070	0	2,701	8,081
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	290	3,035	2,070	0	3,223*	8,618

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	PLANNED	ULTIMATE
* 521 OFF., 2,702 EM	188	188	183

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	8,550	2,131,000	107,968,000	110,099,000
2. LEASED	119	(350)	30,000	30,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		110,129,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				10,091,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				2,116,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				25,274,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				147,610,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11
821	HEATING PLANT HIGH TEMPERATURE WATER SYSTEM	KB	133,900 (SUBSTANDARD)	195,000	0	195,000	2,116	0	2,116	2,116

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DD FORM 1390 (7-58) Superseded DD FORM 1390

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 35

(See note on following page.)

451

15

HEATING PLANT HIGH TEMPERATURE WATER SYSTEM

The preliminary engineering report was prepared by the American Hydrotherm Corp. of New York, N.Y., and is now complete.

The final plans and specifications are now being prepared by the same firm and nearing completion at a fee of $110,664.

Admiral CHEW. The next project is at the Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Md., for replacement of the heating plant high temperature water system at the estimated cost of $2,116,000. Included as the chief component of the station is the Naval Air Test Center, which has for its mission the testing and evaluation of aircraft and their various parts. The capacity of the central heating plant is less than 70 percent of the total heating load. Excessive corrosion in four of the old boilers; inadequate circulating pump capacity; and lack of accumulators and controls, all contribute to an expensive and unreliable operation. Six separately located, hand fired boilers have been salvaged from scrap in an attempt to meet heating loads. Excessive tonnage of coal is burned because of the inefficient heating plant and excessive losses in the steam distribution system. These critical conditions will be overcome only upon installation of the proposed improvements.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How long will it take to amortize the cost of this new hot water heating system at the Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Md., based on savings in operation and other such costs?

Admiral PELTIER. 7½ years, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions on that?

Mr. SIKES. No questions.

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

NAVAL MISSILE CENTER, POINT MUGU, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next project is the Naval Missile Center at Point Mugu, Calif.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL MISSILE CENTER	POINT MUGU, CALIFORNIA	1392600
4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	**5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY**	**6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE**	**7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA**
OXNARD, 10 MILES NORTHWEST	VENTURA	BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS	11TH NAVAL DISTRICT
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
TEST AND EVALUATION OF GUIDED MISSILES AND MISSILE SYSTEMS	1945	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

Conduct tests and evaluation of guided missiles, systems, and to provide services and support to the Pacific Missile Range.

* At NMC, Pt. Mugu, Contract Perronnel 2681: Range Users: Contractors 776, Officers 194 and Enlisted Men 582.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	300	2,517	2,752	0	1,286	6,855
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	291	2,423	2,545	0	3,474	8,733
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	291	2,417	2,444	0	* 4,233	9,385

NO. OF AIRCRAFT — PRESENT 155 — PLANNED 155 — ULTIMATE 188

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	17,588	2,677,000	34,099,000	36,776,000
2. LEASED	64	10,000	857,000	857,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		37,633,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				26,367,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				338,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				32,426,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				96,764,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY				AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11	
	NAVAL MISSILE CENTER										
111	IMPROVEMENT OF RUNWAY OVERRUN AREA	SY	16,650 (SUBSTANDARD)	55,560	0	55,560	264	0	264	264	16
	POINT MUGU										43
214	AUTOMOTIVE MAINTENANCE FACILITY	SF	25,678 (SUBSTANDARD)	27,252	13,626	0	663	330	0	330	44
722	BARRACKS	MN	1,000	990	600	0	1,633	1,421	0	971	145
	SAN NICHOLAS ISLAND										
812	IMPROVEMENT TO ELECTRIC DISTR. SYSTEM	NA	-	-	-	-	74	0	74	74	
								TOTAL	338	1,639	

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DD FORM 1570 (7-58) Supersedes Edition 6060

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 36

IMPROVEMENT OF RUNWAY OVERRUN AREA

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by the district public works officer 11 ND and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by the district public works officer 11 ND.

AUTOMOTIVE MAINTENANCE FACILITY

The preliminary engineering report was prepared by Van Dyke & Barnes, Los Angeles, Calif., at a prorated fee of $4,500 and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been completed by the same firm at a fee of $17,807.

BARRACKS

The preliminary engineering report was prepared by Jones, Emmons, & Associates of Los Angeles, Calif., at a prorated fee of $9,640 and is complete. Final plans for 100-man barracks were completed by the same architect and engineer at a fee of $8,590.

In accordance with a congressional request, the district public works officer 11ND has made a study to develop a more economical design. This study is completed and is being reviewed.

IMPROVEMENT TO ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (SNI)

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Pomeroy, Grad, Urbahn, & Seelye, Los Angeles, Calif., at a prorated fee of $1,080 and is complete.

Admiral CHEW. The third project consists of 4 line items at the estimated cost of $1,639,000 for the Naval Missile Center, Point Mugu, Calif. This station conducts tests and evaluation of guided missiles and systems and supports the Pacific Missile Range. Two of the line items were authorized last year in Public Law 86–149, but were not approved for funding.

The first line item is for stabilization of runway end zone at the estimated cost of $264,000. This is similar to the line item for the naval air station at Oceana which I discussed earlier in this hearing, except that the soil here is coarse, noncompacted material which is incapable of safely supporting the high performance aircraft operating at this station. A stabilized area about 1,000 feet beyond the southerly end of the northeast-southwest runway will be built up of compacted, select material and sealed with asphalt. A culvert will be constructed under the fill for proper drainage; and a short blast pad of soil cement will be provided to minimize erosion of the earth by jet engine exhausts.

The second line item is at the Navy Missile Center, Point Mugu, for construction of an automotive maintenance facility at the estimated cost of $330,000. This item was authorized but not approved for funding last year. As a result of the industrial survey conducted in 1958, we determined that it would be economically feasible to provide at the Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, major repair support for automotive, materials handling and construction equipment of the Naval Missile Center. There are 1,400 pieces of automotive, materials handling, construction and specialized equipment at the Naval Missile Center. It would be wasteful of time and money to transport any of this equipment the 14-mile round trip to Hueneme for minor repairs. It would also be infeasible to transport the specialized equipment to Port Hueneme for any repairs. These pieces include crash vehicles, electronic vans, refuelers, aircraft support equipment and fixed auxiliary equipment.

The importance of such of this specialized equipment to missile test programs and the lack of qualified personnel and proper facilities at Port Hueneme for its repair dictate that the 545 pieces of specialized equipment be supported at Point Mugu. Existing facilities are inadequate in space and structural condition and will have to be replaced. A considerable amount of the maintenance work must, consequently, be done outdoors, with the exposed machinery subject to damage by the elements and windblown sand.

The third line item, also authorized but not approved for funding last year, is for construction of barracks at the estimated cost of $971,000. This item will provide berthing accommodations in 2 buildings for 500 enlisted men. We estimate that of the 2,757 permanently based and 60 transient enlisted men at the Missile Center, approximately 1,990 will require barracks space. There is now available space for only 1,000 of these men, plus 100 spaces under construction, leaving a deficit of 890 spaces. This line item would decrease this deficiency by nearly 73 percent.

The fourth line item is on the San Nicolas Island annex to the Missile Center for improvements to electrical distribution at the estimated cost of $74,000. The electrical demands of new equipment in existing and planned facilities are considerably greater than the present distribution system can safely accept. The voltage drops which result from this condition will cause reduction in the output of transmitter equipment, a loss in antenna energy, a decrease in electronic equipment sensitivity, and a decrease in the reliability of test data. Replacement of the undersized distribution lines with larger cable, and related improvements in the system, are essential for proper operation of the island facilities. The Missile Center as well as the Pacific Missile Range are dependent on the island facilities for much of the important work being undertaken at these activities.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What change have you made in the situation with regard to the automotive maintenance facility since Congress last denied the request for these funds?

Mr. HANABURY. We had a study made by a group of transportation experts who studied this problem from A to Z and concluded that the proposal we have here is the most logical means of fulfilling this requirement. They analyzed all factors and all roads led to doing it ourselves at Point Mugu, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What changes have you made in the barracks structure since you were last before this committee?

Admiral PELTIER. Last year we were proposing to build a smaller 100-man unit. We have made additional engineering evaluations and we feel now we will probably build one 500-man barracks because it will provide housing at a cheaper cost per man than the five 100-man barracks or even two 250-man barracks. We feel we can locate it within the same site using existing roads, and some utilities that are there. So we think this will probably be the ultimate solution.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think your approach is sound and it does reflect a saving. I compliment you for getting straightened out on that premise.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. In your statement a few moments ago you referred to one 500-man barracks. Your justifications show two 250-man barracks.

Admiral PELTIER. Yes. We have gone into this a little further and our present recommendations indicate that we can build this for just a little bit less than the two 250-man barracks.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much less?

Admiral PELTIER. Between $20,000 and $30,000 less on the $971,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions on that?

Mr. SIKES. No questions.

Mr. JONAS. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

WEAPONS FACILITIES, OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next category of projects is the oversea projects. Please place in the record the summary sheet.

(The summary follows:)

Weapons facilities—Outside the United States

Installation and line item	Proposed funding	Fiscal year authorization
Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Islands: Improvement to aviation fuel system	$822,000	1961
Naval Station, Argentia, Newfoundland, Canada: Communication land lines	462,000	1961
Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan:		
Liquid oxygen plant	61,000	1961
Electric powerplant	355,000	1961
Total	416,000	
Naval Air Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Runway extension	3,519,000	1958
Marine Corps Air Facility, Iwakuni, Japan: Improvement of runway	910,000	1961
Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa, Ryukyu Islands:		
Family housing—50 officers, 150 enlisted men	4,358,000	1961
Barracks	809,000	1961
Mess hall	298,000	1961
Bachelor officers' quarters	478,000	1961
Total	5,943,000	
Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Completion of taxiway	460,000	1961
Naval Station, Rota, Spain:		
Navigational aids for channel and harbor	89,000	1961
Family housing—20 officers, 80 enlisted men	2,325,000	1961
Total	2,414,000	
Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Sicily, Italy:		
Aircraft fuel storage facility	133,000	1961
Marine detachment facilities	214,000	1961
Total	347,000	
Naval Air Facility, classified location SB–1: Administration and recreation building	*66,000	1961
Total weapons facilities:		
Unclassified items	15,293,000	
Classified item	66,000	
Total	15,359,000	

Admiral CHEW. The next group of Naval Weapons Facilities projects is for overseas stations. These include 15 unclassified line items at 9 stations at a total cost of $15,293,000, including one previously authorized line item; and one line item at a classified station in the amount of $66,000. All of these stations directly support the operating forces.

NAVAL AIR STATION, AGANA, GUAM

Mr. SHEPPARD. The first item that we take up is the Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL AIR STATION	AGANA, GUAM	1452385

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
AGANA, 4 MILES WEST	GUAM, MARIANA ISLANDS	BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS	MARIANA AREA

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
SUPPORT FLEET AIR OPERATIONS	1946	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

Maintain and operate facilities and provide services and material to support operations of aviation activities and units of the Operating Forces of the Navy, and other activities and units, as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations. Major activities supported:

(1) Headquarters, Commander, Naval Air Bases, Marianas Area
(2) Fleet Weather Central, Guam
(3) Naval Supply Depot, Air Cargo Detachment
(4) Patrol, AEW, heavy attack squadrons, photo and other fleet activities, as designated.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	49	584	415	0	2,342	3,390
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	47	659	415	0	3,276	4,397
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	45	643	415	0	3,029*	4,132

NO. OF AIRCRAFT — PRESENT 125 — PLANNED 166 — ULTIMATE 132

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *474 OFF. & 2,555 EM

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	2,426	418,000	32,620,000	33,038,000
2. LEASED	336	(6,000)	1,885,000	1,885,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		34,923,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				9,960,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				822,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				33,163,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				78,868,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11
124	IMPROVEMENT TO AVIATION FUEL SYSTEM	GA	1,890,000 (1,260,000 SUBSTANDARD)	912,660	0	945,000	822	0	822	822

177

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
NAVDOCKS 2570 (7-58) *Supersedes Bondnos 4090*

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 37

457

(See note on following page.)

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by the officer in charge of construction, Marianas, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being prepared by the officer in charge of construction, Marianas.

I wish you would make some comment with regard to your request for improvement to the aviation fuel system there.

Admiral CHEW. This is a project for improvements to aviation fuel system at the estimated cost of $822,000. Fuel delivered from the existing system is far below the quality required for safe flight of aircraft due to the presence of contaminants resulting from the pipeline sludge deposits. The present 8-inch pipeline from the Sasa Valley fuel farm to the air station requires alteration so that the line may be purged of the contaminants by scraping periodically to guarantee the delivery of clean fuel. In addition, the existing fuel tanks are rusted beyond economical repair and must be replaced. This project will correct this unsafe condition by providing for scraper inserts, sludge tanks, three underground fuel tanks plus the related facilities needed to make this a usable system.

Again, this is an item similar to the safety items.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That we have had before?

Admiral CHEW. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions on this?

Mr. SIKES. No.

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

NAVAL STATION, ARGENTIA, NEWFOUNDLAND

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next is the Naval Station at Argentia, Newfoundland.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY | FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM | DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL STATION	ARGENTIA, NEWFOUNDLAND	6030050

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop., over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
ST. JOHN'S, 90 MILES, NORTHEAST	NEWFOUNDLAND, CANADA	BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS	ATLANTIC OCEAN AREA

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
SUPPORT FLEET OPERATIONS	1943	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

Maintain and operate facilities and provide services and material to support operations of aviation activities and units of the Operating Forces of the Navy and other activities and units as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations. Major Tasks: (1) Provide general logistic support for service craft assigned (2) Support seasonal operation of International Ice Patrol aircraft and surface vessels (3) Provide support for transient weather vessels (4) Provide repair and drydocking services for Atlantic Fleet destroyers, submarines and smaller craft on an emergency voyage repair basis (5) Provide minimum communication services to meet essential current and M-Day requirements (6) Insure that the organization and planning of the Naval Station will provide for the rapid transition of components to the status of separate activities upon mobilization (7) Support AEW Program.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	US CIV.	IND	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	78	1,387	58	1,242	0	2,239	5,004
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	84	1,152	58	952	0	2,893	5,139
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	84	1,176	66	873	0	2,715*	4,914

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT 51	PLANNED 46	ULTIMATE 46

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *406 OFF - 2,309 EM

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	-	-	-	0
2. LEASED	2,916	-	81,387,000	81,387,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		81,387,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				21,043,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				462,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				18,734,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				121,626,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
135	COMMUNICATION LAND LINES	MI	32.2	6.82	0	6.82	462	0	462	462

124

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DD FORM 2570 (7-58) Supersedes Previous Edition

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 38

(See note on following page.)

459

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Carlson & Sweatt, New York, N.Y., and is complete at a fee of $3,585.

Final plans and specifications have been authorized and the selection of an architect-engineer firm is in process.

Do you want to make a brief statement on the requirement at this station?

Admiral CHEW. This project is for construction of communication landlines at the estimated cost of $462,000 at the Naval Station, Argentia, Newfoundland, Canada. This is a key station in our North Atlantic defense system. It maintains facilities for operation of surface and air barriers, search and rescue operations, and general logistic support for various Atlantic Fleet ships. The communication landlines are now underground cables which carry messages received or transmitted by radio. The existing landlines extend from the receiver and transmitter facilities, located in remote areas of the station, to the operations control center. The cold, damp weather, frequent rainstorms, and high tides have caused these lines to deteriorate badly. The demanding communication tasks of the station will not permit the interruptions and extended outages which would result if attempts were made to repair the lines. The proposed item will provide on-station reliability for control of aircraft and ships implementing the barrier program and conducting other fleet operations at that station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions on that?

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

NAVAL AIR STATION, ATSUGI, JAPAN

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now, we pickup the Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL AIR STATION	ATSUGI, JAPAN	1452130
4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	**5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY**	**6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE**	**7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA**
YOKOHOMA 15 MILES EAST	-	BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS	FAR EAST AREA
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**	
SUPPORT FLEET AIR OPERATIONS	1950	[ ] MAINTENANCE [X] ACTIVE [ ] INACTIVE [ ] NEW	

SECTION II. MISSION

Maintain and operate facilities to support regular operations of fleet reconnaissance, anti-submarine, air transport, carrier and fleet marine force tactical support aircraft. Provide aviation ordnance.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	67	590	2,360	0	3,050	6,067
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	59	572	2,383	0	3,919	6,933
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	64	597	2,383	0	3,847	6,891

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT 250	PLANNED 236	ULTIMATE 237

SECTION IV. INVENTORY #553 OFF, 3294 EM

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	-	-	-	0
2. LEASED	1,169	(-)	6,917,000	6,917,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		6,917,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				1,770,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				416,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				8,113,000
			7. GRAND TOTAL	17,216,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11
141	LIQUID OXYGEN PLANT	SF	0	1,886	0	1,886	61	0	61	61
811	ELECTRIC POWER PLANT	KW	0	1,200	0	1,200	355	0	355	355
								TOTAL	416	416

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DD FORM 2570 (7-58) Supersedes DD Form 1390

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 39

(See note on following page.)

539S4—60—22

461

6
63

LIQUID OXYGEN PLANT

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Pacific Architects & Engineers, Inc., Tokyo, and is complete at a fee of $1,000.

Final plans and specifications have been authorized and the selection of an architect-engineer is in process.

ELECTRIC POWERPLANT

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Pacific Architects & Engineers, Inc., Tokyo, and is complete at a fee of $2,750.

Final plans and specifications have been authorized and the selection of an architect-engineer firm is in process.

Admiral CHEW. The third project consists of two line items for $416,000 at the Naval Air Stations, Atsugi, Japan. This station provides shore support to the 7th Fleet. It supports modern aircraft and has the heaviest traffic load of western Pacific naval stations.

The first line item is for construction of a liquid oxygen plant at the estimated cost of $61,000. The crews of high-performance aircraft require breathing oxygen. Currently, liquid oxygen is purchased from Japanese firms. These firms cannot meet current specifications on oxygen purity, thereby creating a hazard to the safety of the aircraft crews. Equipment to generate liquid oxygen is now available at the station, but there is no suitable building available for this operation. The proposed line item will provide for construction of the necessary building, utilities, and related facilities.

The second line item is for construction of an electric powerplant at the estimated cost of $355,000. Power for the station is obtained from a local utility company which generates an erratic 50-cycle supply. This undependable source cannot be used to operate vital electronic equipment such as the GCA system, TACAN and omnirange units, and guided-missile test equipment, which require 60-cycle power. This 40-cycle power is required at 20 locations on the station. It is now being provided by small engine-driven portable generators which have not been designed for, nor can they withstand, day in and day out use for long periods. There were, for instance, 21 navigational aids outages during 1959 due to generator failures. The proposed line item will provide for construction of a reliable source of 60-cycle power.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How long does the Navy propose to stay at this location?

Admiral CHEW. I would say within the foreseeable future we intend to utilize the facilities at Atsugi.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, from all information you have at the moment there is nothing contemplated to get out of Japan?

Admiral CHEW. Nothing, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on that, gentlemen?

Mr. JONAS. What is your source of power there now?

Admiral CHEW. Power for the station is obtained from the local utility company which generates—and I have been there—an erratic 50-cycle power. This undependable source of power is obviously not suitable for the equipment that is needed. Our equipment is basically 60-cycle power equipment.

Mr. JONAS. Will this plant produce your full power requirements? Will you have a surplus?

Admiral PELTIER. We have two sources of power at the station, 50- and 60-cycle power. The American equipment requires 60-cycle power. At the present time we have 23 separate generators. Most of them are wartime installations.

Mr. JONAS. Will this give you a surplus of power?

Admiral PELTIER. No, sir.

Mr. JONAS. That is all.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any other questions?

Mr. LAIRD. No questions.

NAVAL AIR STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next, we have the Naval Air Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL AIR STATION	GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA	1452388

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
GUANTANAMO CITY, 20 MILES NORTHWEST	ORIENTE PROVINCE	BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS	10TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
SUPPORT FLEET AVIATION OPERATION	1941	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

Maintain and operate facilities and provide services and material to support operations of fleet aviation activities and units of the operating forces of the Navy and other activities and units, as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations. Provide support for patrol, carrier, utility, and other fleet aircraft units as designated. Major activities include Naval Dental Clinic, Naval Hospital, Naval Supply Depot, Marine Barracks, NAVBASE, U.S. Naval Security Group Detachment.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	DEPENDENTS CIV.	DEPENDENTS US	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	38	843	275	8	0	1,550	2,714
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	40	810	277	8	0	2,003	3,138
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	35	750	285	9	0	*1,141	2,220

NO. OF AIRCRAFT — PRESENT 131 — PLANNED 122 — ULTIMATE 107

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *173 OFF. 968 EM

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	-		-	-
2. LEASED	4,766	(0)	19,302,000	19,302,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Cost)		19,302,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				10,971,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				0
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				5,064,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				35,337,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11
111	RUNWAY EXTENSION	SY	276,207	98,435	98,435	0	5,619	5,619	0	3,519

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DAVDOCKS 2870 (7-56) Supersedes Davdocks 4080

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 40

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Frederic R. Harris, Inc., New York, N.Y., and modified by the area public works officer, Caribbean, and is complete at a fee of $22,000.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by Frederic R. Harris, Inc., New York, N.Y., at a fee of $27,510.

Congress refused to fund this request for the runway extension last year. What has changed in the situation since that time to warrant funding in the current program?

Admiral CHEW. Mr. Chairman, since it appears in this program, I should like to speak on this item.

There is no question as to the requirement for the extension of the runway as a safety matter, but in view of the recent developments, the overriding political aspects of the Cuban situation, in my management of this program I feel I would be remiss if I did not propose here a delay in this project for these overriding political considerations and a straight out-and-out request that I be allowed authority to substitute an item which you have already approved for funding and which has been authorized and which we consider of equal urgency, if the chairman would permit that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions?

Mr. JONAS. This runway extension is for an expansion of facilities, it is not a question of safety?

Admiral CHEW. It is a runway extension project and has a safety application.

Mr. JONAS. They all have safety features, but you do not feel it is imperative from the standpoint of safety?

Admiral CHEW. I think that would be a matter of judgment, sir. Those who have landed at Guantanamo, I am sure, feel it would have a safety application.

Mr. JONAS. What is the record there as to safety?

Mr. HANABURY. We have lost two F–8U's in the last year.

Admiral CHEW. We have lost two F–8U's going over the end of the runway; yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

MARINE CORPS AIR FACILITY, IWAKUNI, JAPAN

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next is the Marine Corps Air Facility, Iwakuni, Japan.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
MARINE CORPS AIR FACILITY	IWAKUNI, JAPAN	8112430

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
IWAKUNI, WITHIN CITY	YAMAGUCHI PREFECTURE, JAPAN	BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS	FAR EAST AREA

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
SUPPORT AND OPERATION OF NAVY AND MARINE AIRCRAFT	1954	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To maintain and operate facilities and provide services and material to support operations of aviation activities and units of the Operating Forces of the Navy and other activities and units as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations. Units to be supported are:
- Commander Fleet Air Wing
- One Electronics Countermeasures Squadron
- One Fleet Aircraft Service Squadron
- One Seaplane Patrol Squadron
- One Landplane Patrol Squadron
- One Utility Squadron Detachment
- One Marine Aircraft Wing Minus (MAG 11 & 16) Marine Aircraft Groups and Helicopter Detachment
- One Carrier Air Task Group (Occasional)

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	610	4,202	8	0	0	4,820
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	669	4,936	10	0	0	5,615
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	737	5,086	10	0	0	5,833

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	PLANNED	ULTIMATE
	140*	106	106

*EXCLUDES 29 JMSDF AIRCRAFT

SECTION IV. INVENTORY OPERATING UNDER JOINT USE AGREEMENT

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	($) TOTALS
1. OWNED	-	-	-	0
2. LEASED	1,480	(-)	5,103,000	5,103,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		5,103,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				451,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				910,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				5,968,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				15,432,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
111	IMPROVEMENT OF RUNWAY	SY	133,300 (75,240 SUBSTANDARD)	75,240	0	75,240	910	0	910	910

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DAVDOCKS 2570 (7-58) Supersedes Davdocs 4080

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 41

466

10

Okinawa
Okinawa

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by G. H. Anderson & Associates and is complete at a fee of $8,538.

Final plans and specifications have been authorized and the selection of an architect-engineer firm is in process.

Admiral CHEW. The fifth project is at the Marine Corps Air Facility, Iwakuni, Japan, for improvement of runway at the estimated cost of $910,000. The station provides services and materials to aviation activities of the operating forces in the area and supports various missions of aircraft—all contributing to the U.S. "peace" effort in the Far Pacific. Over 4,500 feet of the existing 8,000 feet long runway has deteriorated to a degree which makes it unsafe for operation by the assigned modern aircraft. This portion of the runway is a thin rigid pavement laid on poor subgrade. It is cracked, spalled and unevenly settled. Accomplishment of the proposed line item will restore it to safe operational use. This will be done by construction of a rigid overlay pavement in certain areas and of new rigid pavement in the remaining areas.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How long does the Marine Corps plan to continue occupying this facility, if you know, gentlemen?

Admiral CHEW. I think my statement on the station at Atsugi would be equally applicable to Iwakuni, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What will be the effect of the construction of new aviation facilities on Okinawa on the mission here?

Admiral CHEW. You are speaking of moving from Iwakuni to Okinawa?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Admiral CHEW. It is a heliport there at Futema.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It will have no particular effect on the new facilities as they are planned?

Admiral CHEW. That is correct, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions on this item, gentlemen?

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

NAVAL AIR FACILITY, NAHA, OKINAWA

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we come to the Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL AIR FACILITY	NAHA, OKINAWA	1312830

4. NEAREST CITY (FOR. Over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
NAHA, 6 MILES NORTHEAST	RYUKYU ISLANDS	BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS	FAR EAST AREA

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
SUPPORT FLEET AIR STATIONS	1946	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

Maintain and operate facilities and provide services and material to support operations of aviation activities and units of the operating Forces of the Navy and other activities and units, as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations.

Major Activities Supported

(1) Headquarters, COMFAIRWING ONE
(2) Patrol, utility, carrier and other fleet aircraft units as designated.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	34	324	346	0	763	1,467
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	35	381	346	0	780	1,542
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	37	377	346	0	738*	1,498

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT 35	PLANNED 39	ULTIMATE 36

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *98 OFF & 640 EM

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	-	-	-	0
2. LEASED	1,728	(204,000)	3,233,000	3,233,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		3,233,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				1,025,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				5,943,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				3,486,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				13,687,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.
711	FAMILY HOUSING - 50 OFFICERS AND 150 ENLISTED MEN	FA	31 (INADEQUATE)	498	0	200	10,800	0	4,358	4,358
722	BARRACKS	MN	938 (568 SUBSTANDARD)	312	0	332	809	0	809	809
723	MESSHALL	SF	8,000 (SUBSTANDARD)	7,330	0	7,330	298	0	298	298
724	BACHELOR OFFICERS' QUARTERS	MN	135 (95 SUBSTANDARD)	64	0	50	610	0	478	478
								TOTAL	5,943	5,943

144
141
143
142

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DAVENDCKS 2570 (7-58) Independent Bandsmo 4090

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 42

498

FAMILY HOUSING (MCON)

No preliminary engineering report has been prepared for this item. The allocation of the number of quarters, according to rank is under review by the Bureau of Naval Weapons. On completion of this review site planning will be authorized, followed by the preparation of final plans and specifications.

BARRACKS

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Pacific Architects & Engineers, Inc., Tokyo, and is complete at a fee of $3,750.
Final plans and specifications have been authorized and the selection of an architect-engineer firm is in process.

MESSHALL

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Pacific Architects & Engineers, Inc., Tokyo, and is complete at a fee of $1,383.
Final plans and specifications have been authorized and the selection of an architect-engineer firm is in process.

BACHELOR OFFICERS' QUARTERS

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Pacific Architects & Engineers, Inc., Tokyo, and is complete at a fee of $1,720.
Final plans and specifications have been authorized and the selection of an architect-engineer firm is in process.

Admiral CHEW. The sixth project consists of four line items for a total amount of $5,943,000 at the Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa, Ryukyu Islands. The mission of this station is similar to those of the other U.S. naval stations in the Western Pacific area. The Navy is responsible for providing its own "housekeeping" facilities as a tenant on a U.S. Air Force Base, but uses the main airfield facilities in common with the Air Force.

The first line item is for construction of 200 units of family housing at the estimated cost of $4,385,000. I believe it is plainly evident, Mr. Chairman, that the need for these family housing units is very urgent. To include this line item in a small, tight and austere program; to forego efforts to secure other essential operational facilities in favor of this item, is, I think, indicative of the pressing need. Married officers and enlisted men separated from their families for extended periods in other than wartimes, do not perform their duties at top efficiency. The most advanced submarines, missiles, or aircraft are of no effect without the skilled personnel to guide and control them. All eligible naval personnel in this general area are to be given the opportunity to use this housing within the limits of the number of units provided. There are now only 31 units of inadequate quonset hut housing available. The proposed 200 units will reduce the deficiency to approximately 300 units.

The second line item is for construction of barracks, at the estimated cost of $809,000, for berthing 332 enlisted men. There are now permanent barracks for housing 370 enlisted men. However, approximately 568 permanently based enlisted men are living in quonset huts at the station. In this climate the huts deteriorate rapidly and afford poor protection against the prevalent dampness and torrential rains. Completion of the new barracks will serve to remove the present berthing inequities and boost the morale of the men serving on this remote island. The substandard huts will then be demolished.

The third line item is for construction of messhall at the estimated cost of $298,000. The existing messhall consists of World War II

quonset huts loaned to the Navy by the Air Force, located about 1 mile from the existing permanent Navy barracks. The huts are not weathertight, are not structurally sound and are in a condition to be surveyed. The Air Force messhalls cannot accommodate the Navy's requirement. The proposed messhall will be designed to serve 702 enlisted men.

The final line item is for construction of bachelor officers' quarters at the estimated cost of $478,000. Existing BOQ's are structurally substandard and extremely overcrowded as they provide less than 50 percent of the standard space allowance. One of these BOQ's is adequate for accommodating 40 officers as compared to the estimated requirement for 104 spaces. The proposed BOQ will relieve this deficiency to a considerable extent by providing space for 50 officers.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for family housing facilities at Naha at the present time?

Admiral CHEW. Mr. Chairman, we have 31 pitifully inadequate quonset huts at the air facility at Naha.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What consideration has been given to the utiliza- of existing housing on Okinawa, including that constructed for the Army, the Air Force, or other such governmental organizations, including the so-called Okinawa Housing Corporation?

Admiral CHEW. We now have authority to use 61 units of the GARIOA housing, and we have authority to use of the Okinawa housing by formula within the three services—Army, Navy, and Air Force. We will have 75 to 79. So we have available at the present time 75 and approximately 61 of the GARIOA housing and 31 inadequate quonset huts.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are asking for a total of 200 family housing units, for 50 officers and 150 enlisted men?

Admiral CHEW. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are utilizing all the housing units that are available?

Admiral CHEW. We are actually using them.

Mr. SHEPPARD. So the new housing you are asking for represents a backlog?

Admiral CHEW. We have used more of the Okinawa Housing Corporation housing than the 75 I mentioned under the formula. We previously have been able to use up to 168, but by determination of the area commander our share, which is based on a formula of assets, and our assets are only 31, we have had our share correspondingly reduced.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will any of these facilities require the taking of additional land?

Admiral CHEW. We have the land available, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You show 98 officers and 640 enlisted men supported at this facility. Where are these personnel located?

Admiral CHEW. We have the naval air station at Naha. We will have the communication station that we previously spoke to earlier, and we will have units at Futema.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are they included in this housing project?

Admiral CHEW. The housing is programed to take care of our most urgent needs. At the time we had considered all of the activities in our housing requirements.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That includes the supporting personnel as well?

Admiral CHEW. These are just for the military personnel, sir. The marines are not included at Futema in determining these housing requirements because the marines, as you know, have no families on the island.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Your justifications show 98 officers and 640 enlisted men supported at this facility.

Admiral CHEW. The majority are at the Naval Air Station at Naha. The increased personnel on the island would be those for the security station, from 322 to 377.

Mr. SHEPPARD. My question has to do first with the 98 officers and 640 enlisted men.

Admiral CHEW. The top block you are looking at is for the station of Naha specifically. The 98 are the patrol squadrons that are stationed there.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are the squadrons located there permanently or on a rotation basis?

Admiral CHEW. Permanently, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the tour of duty there?

Admiral CHEW. It is about 2 years, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From your statement it appears you are providing housing for the supporting elements?

Admiral CHEW. Yes; the squadrons supported at Naha we have not been able to accept under the limited conditions. Some of the people cannot go out there at the present time because housing is just not available.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think it would be well if you provided for the record a complete picture of the housing situation there, because I believe there is some confusion.

Admiral CHEW. Yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

The Navy's housing picture on Okinawa at the present time is as follows:

Navy quarters (all are quonset huts and are inadequate)	31
GARIOA (government and relief in occupied areas)	61
OHC (Okinawa Housing Corp.)	168

Two hundred GARIOA units were constructed with appropriated funds and administered by the Army. Previously, Army had no requirement for these units and permitted Air Force and Navy personnel to occupy such units. At the present time Navy is permitted to use 61 units. In view of Army's buildup in this area it is not known when Navy's use may be terminated.

Under a commander in chief Pacific policy approved November 16, 1959, the Navy is allocated only 79 housing units out of the Okinawa Housing Corp. housing assets which total approximately 438 units. Accordingly, current Navy occupancy in 168 units will be reduced to 79 units in the near future.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How will the mission of this installation be adversely affected if all of this family housing is not constructed?

Admiral CHEW. I think we would have a serious morale problem. I would like to show you some pictures of what is happening right now. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. JONAS. Your requirement is for 498 units of family housing on Okinawa?

Admiral CHEW. Yes. This proposed 200 units will reduce the deficiency to approximately 300.

Mr. JONAS. You say your requirement is for 498 units?

Admiral CHEW. 498 units, yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. And you have all your people who are housed in family units in quonset huts?

Admiral CHEW. Thirty-one units are quonset huts. The others are GARIOA (government and relief in occupied areas). We are allowed to use 61 of those, although they were controlled originally by the Army, and 79 units are Okinawa Housing Corp. housing.

Mr. JONAS. Is that housing adequate, the 79 units?

Admiral CHEW. They could be made adequate. I would say generally speaking if taken over as housing they would be adequate.

Mr. JONAS. You are using 79 units of the Okinawa Housing Corp. housing?

Admiral CHEW. We are being reduced to that number from 168.

Mr. JONAS. What kind of construction is that?

Admiral CHEW. I think it is a concrete slab construction, if I remember correctly.

(Additional information follows:)

The 438 units owned by the Okinawa Housing Corp. consists of 230 2-bedroom concrete block units, 78 3-bedroom concrete block units, and 130 quonsets.

Mr. JONAS. Are those units more expensive than the units you plan to construct or less expensive? I am trying to resolve the problem in my own mind as to whether you could not provide more housing than you are asking for by using a little less expensive plan. If the 79 units of the Okinawa Housing Corp. you are now using plus the 61 GARIOA units are adequate, it seems to me you have a pretty serious housing situation there.

Admiral CHEW. We have a very serious housing situation. The 200 units, as we point out, was a prudent figure. It will not meet our deficit at this time. It will simply reduce it to approximately 300 units.

Mr. JONAS. Where will the remaining 300 families be housed?

Admiral CHEW. When we give up the remainder of the Okinawa Housing Corp. housing they will not be allowed to go out until housing is available.

Mr. JONAS. Where do you have them housed now?

Admiral CHEW. In some of the additional Okinawa Housing Corp. housing. As I say, we are occupying more than 79 at the present time. We are occupying about 150. As they vacate we lose the housing by formula.

Mr. JONAS. What do they pay as rent for that housing?

Admiral CHEW. I would have to supply that.

Mr. JONAS. Is it expensive or comparable?

Admiral CHEW. It is comparable to BAQ (basic allowance for quarters).

Mr. JONAS. That is all.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What consideration have you given to the utilization of other barrack space on this island presently used by the Army and Marine Corps for the housing of personnel?

Admiral CHEW. Actually, Mr. Chairman, some of our men are using Air Force barracks now. We have investigated this and have been provided space in certain Air Force barracks to the limit of their capacity.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How does the cost, planning, and design of these barracks compare with those being built for the Marine Corps?

Admiral PELTIER. I do not have the Marine Corps cost before me, but this cost of $1,870 per man in Okinawa is reasonably low.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Supply that for the record, please.
Admiral PELTIER. Yes, sir.
(Information requested follows:)

The barracks which are being built for the marines have a comparable unit cost of $1,250 per man based upon the standard of 125 square feet per man. The cost differential is explainable as follows:

(*a*) At Camp Schwab and Camp Hansen, where space is no problem, repetitive one story tilt-up design, adaptable to assembly-line techniques, is used exclusively on over 100 buildings at each camp. Of this number there are 58 barracks alone at Camp Schwab and 75 barracks at Camp Hansen.

(*b*) At the naval air facility, space is limited and it is proposed to build two two-story barracks by the conventional construction methods.

(*c*) The size of the job at Camp Schwab ($8.5 million) and at Camp Hansen ($10 million) effected favorable bids.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for BOQ's at the present time and what will be done with these facilities?

Admiral CHEW. Mr. Chairman, these BOQ's are deplorable. They are substandard and overcrowded. One BOQ is adequate for 40 officers against the estimated requirement of 402 spaces. This proposal will not take care of our complete requirements.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, if this request is granted you will still have to use the quarters that are there?

Admiral CHEW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the existing BOQ situation in other military installations on the island? Have you checked that out?

Admiral CHEW. Yes, we have. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions on that item, gentlemen?

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

NAVAL STATION, ROOSEVELT ROADS, P.R.

Mr. SIKES. We shall now consider the requirements for the naval station at Roosevelt Roads, P.R. You are asking for $460,000 for completion of the taxiway.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL STATION	ROOSEVELT ROADS, PUERTO RICO	6030 665
4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	**5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY**	**6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE** / **7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA**
CEIBA, 2 MILES NORTHWEST		BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS / 10TH NAVAL DISTRICT
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
SUPPORT FLEET OPERATIONS	1943	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

Maintain and operate facilities and provide services and material to support operations of aviation activities and units of the Operating Forces of the Navy and other activities and units, as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations.

Major Activities Supported

(1) Guided Missile Units as designated
(2) Patrol, carrier, utility, airship and other fleet aircraft units as designated
(3) Guided Missile Operations Control Unit

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	55	577	618	0	2,002	3,252
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	45	555	732	0	4,662	5,994
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	65	680	886	0	*4,872	6,503

NO. OF AIRCRAFT — PRESENT 18 — PLANNED 168 — ULTIMATE 172

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *528 OFF 4,244 EM

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	10,494	986,000	42,724,000	43,710,000
2. LEASED	69	-	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		43,710,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				27,343,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				460,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				25,353,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				96,866,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11
112	COMPLETION OF TAXIWAY	SY	167,869	26,444	0	18,750	586	0	460	460

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DD FORM 1390 (7-58) Supersedes Previous Issue

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 43

474

174

The public ... velopment ... $460,000 ... overall ... airfield ... execution ... of runway ... buildings ... in Jet ... tive ... transient ... tion ... after ... tion ... operations ... ties ... Activities ... will ... support ... Weapons ... expansion ... for ...

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by the area public works officer, Caribbean Area, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by Clark, Buhr, and Nexsen, Salisbury, Md., at a fee of $23,171.

Admiral CHEW. The seventh project is at the naval station, Roosevelt Roads, P.R., for completion of taxiway at the estimated cost of $460,000. This station serves the operating forces, similar to our other overseas activities, in support of patrol, carrier, utility, and other fleet aircraft. It also supports combined air, surface, and submarine exercises in operational training with guided missiles. There is a gap of 2,250 feet in the taxiway leading from the northeast-southwest runway. In a previous austere construction program a taxiway was built from the runway end to the maintenance hangar, leaving a gap in the taxiway paralleling the runway and to the refueling islands. Jet squadrons are assigned to this station with specific training objectives which must be attained in very limited periods of intensive training. Aircraft must now taxi on the runway to the takeoff position, which is a very dangerous operation. In addition, jet planes, after landing, must taxi a circuitous route to reach the refueling stations, thereby slowing the training procedures. The proposed line item will provide the missing pavement and correct the present operating deficiencies.

Mr. SIKES. Is there anything of note in connection with this project, Admiral?

Admiral CHEW. No, sir. This is the completion of the taxiway which has always been planned but has never been completed. This simply completes the standard taxiway on both sides of the runway. We now can operate by using the runway itself for certain taxiing exercises, which is very dangerous.

This is simple completion of the taxiways.

Mr. SIKES. Questions, Mr. Jonas?

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

NAVAL STATION, ROTA, SPAIN

Mr. SIKES. We shall take up Naval Station, Rota, Spain, where you have the requirements for navigation aids for channel and harbor for $89,000, family housing, $2,325,000.

Will you tell us the requirements for these, Admiral?

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL STATION	ROTA, SPAIN	1452-778

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
CADIZ, 2 MILES SOUTHWEST	PROVINCE OF CADIZ, SPAIN	BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS	EASTERN ATLANTIC & MEDITERRANEAN

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
SUPPORT AVIATION ACTIVITIES AND OPERATING FORCES	1957	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

Maintain and operate facilities and provide services and material to support operations of aviation activities and units of the Operating Forces of the Navy and other activities and units as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations.

Major Tasks: 1. Maintain an aircraft replacement pool. 2. Provide Fleet support communications including secondary ship-to-shore, relay, and point-to-point, in support of U.S. Navy activities in the Cadiz area. 3. Operate and maintain port facilities, including aircraft off-loading facilities, to support U.S. Naval activities in the Cadiz area. 4. Support fleet aviation units.

Major activities supported: 1. COMNAVACTS, Rota. 2. Naval Fuel Facility. 3. Marine Barracks. 4. Patrol, carrier, transport, airships, and other fleet aircraft units as designated.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	65	490	843	0	1,780	3,178
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	55	475	650	0	1,680	2,860
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	70	610	753	0	1,728*	3,161

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT 19	PLANNED 105	ULTIMATE 83

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *254 OFF 1,474 EM

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	-	-	-	0
2. LEASED	5,736	-	17,868,000	17,868,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Excess Land Rent)		17,868,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				67,565,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				2,414,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				10,028,000
			7. GRAND TOTAL	97,875,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11
134	NAVIGATIONAL AIDS FOR CHANNEL AND HARBOR	EA	0	12	0	12	89	0	89	89
711	FAMILY HOUSING - 20 OFFICERS, 80 ENLISTED MEN	FA	496	245	0	100	5,696	0	2,325	2,325
								TOTAL	2,414	2,414

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
NAVDOCKS 2870 (7-58) Supersedes Replaces 0080

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 44

476

19

146

NAVIGATIONAL AIDS FOR CHANNEL AND HARBOR

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by the officer in charge of construction, Madrid, Spain, and is complete.
The final plans and specifications have been authorized and the selection of an architect-engineer is in process.

FAMILY HOUSING (20 OFFICERS, 80 ENLISTED MEN)

No preliminary engineering report was authorized.
The final plans and specifications have been authorized and the selection of an architect-engineer is in process.

Admiral CHEW. Anything in navigational aids in Spanish waters would be a responsibility of the Spanish Government, as you would imagine. This is for the inner harbor and it is the breakwater and rocky shoals at the entrance near Rota Point. This will include channel buoys and lights inside the harbor to outline the dredged basin and full utilization of the harbor could not be made without these additional navigational aids, sir.

The line item for family housing, sir, we have an estimated requirement of 741 units and 496 units are available; 162 of those were built with military construction funds; and 334 with surplus commodity credit funds.

The deficiency at present is 245 units. This item is for the construction of a hundred units.

As you undoubtedly know, private rental housing in the nearby communities is limited and available acceptable Spanish housing is being used by the contractor and service personnel and civilian employees.

Mr. SIKES. Will that situation continue?

Admiral CHEW. Additional migrant Spanish skilled and professional personnel are being hired at the present time, sir, and these Spaniards, in addition to those who were dispossessed of their land when the base was constructed further contribute to the housing shortage. Incidentally, sir, we understand that the mayors of the nearby towns have appealed to the U.S. Embassy for assistance in alleviating the housing shortage. This is one of two commodity credit housing line items.

This is a commodity credit housing line item to be funded by foreign currencies, which are to be purchased with military construction funds. Prior to this year we did not have to purchase the currencies.

Mr. SIKES. What is the nature of the military personnel which you show as supported by this naval station?

Admiral CHEW. We have at the present time 65 officers and 490 enlisted men, with an ultimate planned onbase personnel of 70 and 610 enlisted men. I might add that there is in addition the requirement eventually for additional personnel. Those personnel will number 15 officers and 150 additional men, sir.

Mr. SIKES. You are convinced housing is not available locally?

Admiral CHEW. We are convinced it is not available locally and as I said, we have been requested by the mayors of the local communities to provide housing for our personnel in order to alleviate, I presume, the unfavorable situation with regard to the Spanish.

Mr. SIKES. The committee has been concerned about what appears to be rather high construction costs per unit. What is the basis for this cost?

Admiral PELTIER. Mr. Chairman, the Spanish economy has inflated some. We have had several decrees by the Spanish Govern-

ment, which has raised the salary, or raised wages of Spanish laborers. One of them was as high as 57 percent. That is one factor that is affecting our cost.

This is also a smaller number of units and that will probably account for some increased cost. Also this cost must bear the entire cost of site development and extension of roads and utilities.

Mr. SIKES. Will you submit for the record any detailed information that you have on this cost situation?

Admiral PELTIER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. What is the status of plans?

Admiral PELTIER. We will adapt existing plans, the floor plans of what we have already built and we will have to develop the siting plans, utilities, and roads. That will be done by our office in Spain.

Mr. SIKES. What were the cost and square footages for comparable grade structure quarters in the military housing dwellings constructed here previously?

Admiral PELTIER. My rough guess on that without having the figures is about 30 percent, of what the initial cost was. Our factor now is about 1.3 in this area. It was down about one. It has gone up on this housing.

Mr. SIKES. Have you built others in this area?

Admiral PELTIER. We have built some commodity credit units. They were done 2 or 3 years previous to this and before some of this impact hit the area.

Mr. SIKES. You are going to supply reasons for this additional cost?

Admiral PELTIER. Yes, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

As stated above the additional cost is attributed to increased cost of labor and materials imposed by the Spanish Government decrees, the smaller size of this project, and the lack of benefits previously derived from our big concrete-plant production, and larger contract operations.

Admiral PELTIER. I would like to say particularly on the navigation aids, this may be accomplished by our Seabees. We have a battalion of Seabees in Rota the year around. We may accomplish this work by Seabees.

Mr. SIKES. Let me be sure I understand you. Did you tell me that you may do this construction with Seabees?

Admiral PELTIER. Yes, sir; particularly the navigation aid.

Admiral CHEW. Installation of the buoys, sir.

Admiral PELTIER. The buoys will probably be bought through the Coast Guard.

Mr. SIKES. Questions, Mr. Jonas?

Mr. JONAS. Do you provide housing for your civilian employees there? How are they housed? You have more civilians on board than you have Naval personnel?

Admiral CHEW. We have 843 civilians right now, sir, and that will reduce to about 753, sir, in 1963, so that there would be housing for the officers, enlisted men, and the American civilians.

Mr. JONAS. You do try to provide housing for your stateside civilians working over there?

Admiral CHEW. Yes, sir.

NAVAL AIR FACILITY, SIGONELLA, SICILY

Mr. SIKES. The next project that we come to is the Naval Air Facility at Sigonella, Sicily.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL AIR FACILITY	SIGONELLA, SICILY	1312-915
4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	**5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY**	**6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE**	**7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA**
CATANIA, 15 MILES NORTHEAST	ITALY	BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS	EASTERN ATLANTIC & MEDITERRANEAN
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
FLEET SUPPORT	1959	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

Maintain and operate facilities and provide services and materials to support operations of aviation activities and units of the Operating Forces of the Navy and other activities and units, as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations.

(a) Major Tasks
1. Support Fleet Aviation Units

(b) Major Activities supported
1. Patrol and other fleet aircraft unit as designated

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	37	329	6 54	0	0	426
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	37	320	23 70	0	359	809
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	37	320	26 250	0	*424	1,057

NO. OF AIRCRAFT — PRESENT 0 — PLANNED 40 — ULTIMATE 37

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *78 OFF 346 EM

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	-	-	-	0
2. LEASED	LAND MADE AVAILABLE BY ITALIAN GOVERNMENT			0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Cost)		0
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				3,617,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				347,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				1,412,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				5,376,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
124	AIRCRAFT JET FUEL STORAGE FACILITY	GA	0	608,000	0	250,000	320	0	133	133
721	MARINE DETACHMENT FACILITIES	SF	0	14,880	0	14,830	214	0	214	214
								TOTAL	347	347

72
117

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DD FORM 1390 (7-58) Supersedes Edition 4090

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 45

(See note on following page.)

AIRCRAFT FUEL STORAGE FACILITY

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by the area public works officer, Eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean Area, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and the selection of an architect-engineer is in process.

MARINE DETACHMENT FACILITIES

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Daniel, Mann, Johnson & Associates, Rome, Italy, and is complete at a fee of $3,700.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and the selection of an architect-engineer is in process.

Mr. SIKES. There is a requirement for an aircraft jet fuel storage facility for $133,000, Marine Detachment facilities, $214,000.

Admiral CHEW. The first line item is for construction of the aircraft jet-fuel storage at an estimated cost of $133,000.

The current plans call for occasional deployment of 6th Fleet carrier jet aircraft while they are using the target facilities in Sicily.

In addition, occasional jet aircraft will be diverted to this facility due to mechanical difficulties, et cetera. We estimate that since there is no existing storage, there is an ultimate requirement for a 30-day supply of 608,000 gallons of jet fuel. This line item will fulfill part of this need by providing about 250,000 gallons capacity in underground tanks.

Mr. SIKES. Is this an immediate need?

Admiral CHEW. Yes, sir; this is an immediate need.

The second item is for the Marine Detachment facilities at a cost of $214,000. A 69-man Marine force is assigned to the facility for the security of the ordnance complex. They require the housing, messing, and administrative space. The Navy main housing and messing facilities are about 7 miles distant from the airfield over a narrow, winding road, which takes 25 to 35 minutes to traverse by bus. It is impracticable to transport all personnel from the field to the messhall and back just for serving the noon meals and for relieving watch.

An auxiliary mess is required at the field to accommodate 400 personnel for noon meal and a lesser number of duty personnel for the other meals. There are no existing facilities at the field which could meet this requirement and the proposed facilities are necessary for these several purposes. That is, the personnel who have to be transported back and forth, or would have to be transported back and forth, plus those that were there for the watch and duty stations.

Mr. SIKES. Questions?

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Mr. SIKES. The next category of projects is Supply Facilities. Please place the statement in the record at this point.

(The matter referred to follows:)

STATEMENT

The requested appropriation in this program for supply facilities under the management control of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts totals $842,000 for four items.

One of the items will provide for the physical installation of an electronic data-processing machine for effective accomplishment of material and operating management functions.

An item is proposed to provide controlled humidity storage in several warehouses in order that vital materials can be effectively maintained for issue to the fleet.

Another item will provide required effective supply support in the field of special weapons.

The remaining item is necessary to eliminate the discharge of raw sewage into waterways in violation of State law.

BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SIKES. We shall turn to page 46, "Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, District of Columbia."

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	-

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. Over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
WITHIN CITY OF WASHINGTON	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS	POTOMAC RIVER NAVAL COMMAND

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
MANAGEMENT OF SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	1941	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To provide development and the conducting of research and development projects covering supply phases of the Navy Supply system, including supply facilities afloat.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	125	-	862	-	-	987
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	118	-	834	-	-	952
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1961	118	-	834	-	-	952

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	PLANNED	ULTIMATE

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	-	-	-	0
2. LEASED	-	-	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		0
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				85,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				0
7. GRAND TOTAL				85,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	N/A AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9	9	10	11
610	ALTERATIONS FOR EDPM INSTALLATION	SF	0	3,000	0	3,000	85	0	85	85

148

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DD FORM 1570 (7-58) Supersedes Previous Edition

BOOK NO. II PAGE NO. 46

482

A preliminary cost estimate for this item has been prepared by General Services Administration.

Preparation of final plans and specifications will proceed on final selection of exact electronic data processing machine equipment to be installed.

Mr. SIKES. Here is shown a requirement for alterations of EDPM installation at a cost of $85,000.

Will you please discuss that requirement?

Admiral CHEW. This is in Washington in the headquarters of the Navy Supplies System and since the Bureau is engaged in managing things rather than producing them, the EDPM is required for the effective and efficient maintenance and reporting of Bureau appropriation account and other accrued expenditures, financial inventory control, manpower information, stores accounting, budget preparation, and related recordkeeping for both materiel and operating management functions.

Available space at the headquarters in the Navy Annex, which is the permanent building, will be altered to accommodate the EDPM. This planned tape-operated system will provide the speed, flexibility and accuracy essential to the functions and operations of the Bureau. This is part of the program to provide the EDPM's in place of the less efficient mechanical devices.

Mr. SIKES. I think you anticipate the question that is going to follow. You have a great deal of data-processing equipment in the Washington area. Why is it not possible to handle this work on existing facilities?

Admiral LONG. All EDPM facilities in the Washington area have, as they have been developed and put into use, been checked with existing equipment. Now basically in this field of electronic data processing most of the units are tailored for the particular application in mind.

There were two of them locally, BuPers and BuWeps, that have EDPM and the possibility of doing this work on theirs was checked out with them in detail but we find that BuPers is using theirs on a 24-hour basis, and BuWeps on a two-shift basis and for that reason would not have time available for the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.

Mr. SIKES. Have you checked with Army and Air Force installations to determine the availability of their equipment?

Admiral LONG. Yes, sir. That is done through the Management Office of the Navy, sir, and is done as a routine thing.

Mr. SIKES. The answer is "No?"

Admiral LONG. The answer is "No, sir."

Mr. SIKES. What are you doing now in lieu of the equipment?

Admiral LONG. In lieu of the equipment we are using EAM equipment, which is electrical and mechanical equipment. What we anticipate doing with EDPM that we cannot do with EAM is more work faster. We are doing a lot of this by hand now that the EAM cannot handle.

Mr. SIKES. Questions, Mr. Sheppard?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No questions.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Jonas?

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

NAVAL SUPPLY CENTER, NORFOLK, VA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall pick up the next item, the Naval Supply Center at Norfolk.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL SUPPLY CENTER	NORFOLK, VIRGINIA	6170595

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. Over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
NORFOLK, VIRGINIA - WITHIN CITY	INDEPENDENT CITY	BUREAU OF SUPPLIES & ACCOUNTS	5TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
SUPPLY CENTER GENERAL	1919	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To provide support for fleet units and assigned continental and overseas activities in terms of general stores, specified technical materials and specified services.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	67	75	4,992	-	-	5,134
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	67	75	4,640	-	-	4,782
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1961	67	75	4,640	-	-	4,782

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	PLANNED	ULTIMATE

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	4,083	578,000	75,060,000	75,638,000
2. LEASED	1	(117)	2,982,000	2,982,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		78,620,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				128,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				151,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				5,154,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				84,053,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
441	HUMIDITY CONTROL FOR WAREHOUSES	SF	6,400	304,400	0	304,400	151	0	151	151

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DD FORM 1390 (7-58) Supersedes previous edition

BOOK NO. II PAGE NO. 47

149

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by the district public works officer, Fifth Naval District and is complete.

Final plans and specifications are being prepared by the same organization.

Admiral CHEW. The next project is at the Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Va., for humidity control for warehouses at the estimated cost of $151,000. This center, the East Coast counterpart of the Naval Supply Center at Oakland, is the Atlantic Fleet's major continental sypply support base. The project will be for the conversion of three existing warehouses to controlled humidity storage space. This storage space will protect electronic, ordnance, and ship repair parts and equipment, valued at approximately $68 million, from the damaging effects of uncontrolled atmospheric humidity. This will reduce periodic inspections, reduce preservation and cyclic represervation requirements, provide a holding area where material deterioration will be retarded, and continuously maintain materials in the same condition as they are received. The effectiveness and value of this system has been proven by Navy experience.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How have you been getting along at this rather large supply center over the period of time that you have without dehumidified storage?

Admiral CHEW. I think the best way to answer that, Admiral Long, is to show pictures of parts that are stored in warehouses without the dehumidifying equipment.

Admiral LONG. This dehumidifying equipment, Mr. Chairman, is a new approach to an old problem and we feel a cheaper approach. What we like to call this, really, is deep freezing of inorganic material. It holds the material at the status that it is in when you put it in this dehumidified warehouse. This is a new development, as I say, and has been adopted enthusiastically by the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy.

The Navy has been a leader in this area and we have, particularly overseas, developed dehumidified space in places like Guam. Where our humidity in Norfolk is still not as great as that in Guam, it is still appreciable. So in these tidewater areas where humidity is high in the summertime, we find it is really a paying proposition.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, the old system of in many instances encasing these materials, metal and particularly in that category, in a grease solution, is not working out to the satisfaction that the present system is?

Admiral LONG. It is working out, but won't work out as well as this dehumidified storage.

Actually, the business of preservation in the military, through World War II and up until recent years, has been an expensive proposition. We have had preservatives of various kinds and various types and materials used for preservatives.

They have had one thing in common and that is expense. What we are trying to do is to find a new approach to preservation so we can hold the material really in refrigeration until we know how we are going to use it. If we are going to send it overseas, we will preserve it, but if we are going to use it locally, there is no sense in heavy preservation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the mechanical device you use to pick up humidity within the confines of the building? What type of system do you use?

We have several on the market. I am interested in the type you are using.

Mr. PESSAUD. In brief, you have two cylinders about 3 feet in diameter and all it does is take the air out of the warehouse by pushing it through the cylinders. It absorbs the moisture out of the air and throws it back into the warehouse. It pushes the air through the cylinder that has silica gel or alumina. Our original system used activated alumina (dehydrated aluminum trihydrate). We now use silica gel. It absorbs the moisture out of the air and pushes it in the warehouse at the rate of 1,500 cubic feet per minute (500 pounds water removal per day at 70° F. and 35 percent relative humidity). The reason for the two beds is you have a cycle. When one bed gets saturated, it switches over to the other bed. The bed that is not in operation is heated with electrical coils. It dries the material within the cylinder and the extracted water runs out of a pipe to the outside of the building.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, what you do is keep using the same content, absorbing content you have and you demoisturize that and let it go outside?

Mr. PESSAUD. Yes. In fact, it is the same as the dehumidifiers you would buy for your basement, only on a larger scale.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What did you say the capacity was again?

Mr. PESSAUD. Fifteen hundred cubic feet per minute.

Mr. PESSAUD. They cost us approximately $5,000. I might say with regard to this project that we have the machines available. We had some dehumidified space at Scotia, N.Y., being turned over to GSA. We will use these available machines for this project.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You find that mechanically speaking, your dehumidifier has a maximum apex of operation, in other words, within the ceiling areas? Are you limited in that capacity; in other words, how high can you go within the confines of a building and still do the job percentagewise?

Mr. PESSAUD. The existing buildings that we have, have an approximate height of 26 to 32 feet. We have found it takes one of these machines in the tidewater area to handle approximately 40,000 gross square foot area.

It is working very nicely.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on the item, gentlemen?

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

NAVAL SUPPLY CENTER, OAKLAND, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall pick up the next item having to do with the Naval Supply Center at Oakland, Calif.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL SUPPLY CENTER	OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA	6170650

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA - WITHIN CITY	ALAMEDA	BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS	12TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
SUPPLY CENTER	1941	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To provide support for fleet units and assigned continental and overseas activities in terms of general stores, specified technical materials and specified services.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	84	80	5143	-	-	5307
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	84	80	4662	-	-	4826
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1961	84	80	4662	-	-	4826

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT -	PLANNED -	ULTIMATE -

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	517	2,139,000	48,566,000	50,705,000
2. LEASED	17	(16,000)	0	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		50,705,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				146,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST UNCLASSIFIED ITEM ONLY				358,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				8,907,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				60,116,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11
	CLASSIFIED ITEM			(SEE CLASSIFIED BOOK)						
832	SEWAGE COLLECTION LINES	LF	37,640	11,055	0	11,055	358	0	358	358

151

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DAVENDCER 2570 (7-58) Superseden Previous Form

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 48

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Kennedy Engineers, San Francisco, Calif., at a fee of $1,970, and is complete.

Negotiations are in process for fee determination for final plans and specifications.

Admiral CHEW. The third project is at the Naval Supply Center, Oakland, Calif. This center is the primary material distribution point in support of the Pacific Fleet and the Pacific theater of operations. The unclassified line item at this center is for construction of sewage collection lines at the estimated cost of $358,000. There are 20 sources of sewage within the center which discharge directly into San Francisco Bay in violation of a California State law. Executive Order 10014 of 1948 directs compliance with State laws relative to the abatement of pollution of waterways. The proposed line item will correct this condition by construction of new sewer lines for collecting the raw sewage from these 20 sources, by modernization of two existing sewage pumping stations and provision of two new pumping stations to convey the sewage to the existing trunk sewer of the municipal sewage treatment system.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If these funds are granted for sewage collection lines, will it take care of this problem?

Admiral LONG. It will take complete care of the Naval Supply Center at Oakland.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are projecting this to take care of eventualities of tomorrow, if you have expansion within the area or are you just presently taking care of your workload at the moment?

Admiral LONG. I would imagine there is some margin of safety on this.

Mr. PESSAUD. Yes, Mr. Chairman. We do not contemplate treating our own sewage. This is simply putting the sewage collection system in to tie into the main sewer line of the city.

The capacity on the line could take care of an expansion there, yes, sir. However, if we did build any additional facilities, you would not have to tie into the existing system.

Mr. SHEPPARD. As far as the present is concerned, it will take care of your maximum requirement as of now.

Mr. PESSAUD. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on the item?

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we take up the Marine Corps Facilities. Please place in the record the summary sheet and prepared statement for this category of projects.

(The matter referred to follows:)

Marine corps facilities—Inside the United States

Installation and line item	Proposed funding	Fiscal year authorization
Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany Ga.: Ventilation for Repair Shop	$65,000	1961
Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, Calif.: Loading area, Yermo	82,000	1961
Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, N.C.: Bachelor Officers' Quarters	433,000	1961
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, S.C.:		
Recruit barracks	1,203,000	1961
Religious activities center	252,000	1961
Total	1,455,000	
Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, Calif.:		
Combat training school	460,000	1961
Administration buildings	470,000	1961
Messhalls	845,000	1961
Heating system, Camp Phillips (2d increment)	198,000	1961
Total	1,973,000	
Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Va.:		
Research library	210,000	1961
Combat conditioning facility	505,000	1961
Total	715,000	

U.S. MARINE CORPS CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 1961

The Marine Corps' construction program for fiscal year 1961 is designed to provide only the necessary minimum facilities to properly house the Marine Corps and to provide only those facilities that are absolutely essential to support the training program of the Marine Corps. This construction program is composed of 14 line items at 8 continental activities with a total valuation of $5,011,000. It has been developed from guidelines established by the Department of Defense, and represents only the most urgent requirements.

The Marine Corps is still utilizing many temporary structures which were originally designed with a five-year life expectancy and built during the early stages of World War II. Materials used in the construction of these facilities consist basically of second grade lumber, canvas or quonset huts. The maintenance costs required to keep these temporary facilities in the minimum state of repair and serviceability are guarded. Expenditure of maintenance funds on a high rate on such structures places them in the program for replacement. The Marine Corps believes that readiness is related to men, material, and facilities in equal proportions. Our program is based on a proper balance of these factors.

Admiral CHEW. Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I shall relinquish my place to the next witness, Major General Allen, who is present to outline to you and the committee the Marine Corps' requirements for military construction.

MARINE CORPS SUPPLY CENTER, ALBANY, GA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The first item has to do with the Marine Corps Supply Center at Albany, Ga.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY | FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM | DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
MARINE CORPS SUPPLY CENTER	ALBANY, GEORGIA	8383075

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
ALBANY, GEORGIA, 7 MILES NORTHWEST	DOUGHERTY	MARINE CORPS	6TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
SUPPLY DEPOT GENERAL	1951	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To procure, maintain, repair, store and distribute all classes of supplies and equipment as assigned.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JULY 1959	114	1,399	1,819	-	-	3,332
2. PLANNED - END FY 1963	114	1,245	1,852	-	-	3,211
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	114	1,245	1,852	-	-	3,211

NO. OF AIRCRAFT — PRESENT - PLANNED - ULTIMATE -

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	3,678	711,000	49,259,000	49,970,000
2. LEASED	2	-	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		49,970,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				1,158,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				65,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				9,386,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				60,579,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
214	VENTILATION FOR REPAIR SHOP	LS	-	-	-	-	65	0	65	65

20

490

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by the public works officer, Albany, Ga., and the district public works officer, Sixth Naval District.

Final plans and specifications will be prepared by Jones & Cleckley, August, Ga., at a fee not yet determined.

We have one very small line item, ventilation of a repair shop. The money requested is minor. I have no questions on the item.

Do you have any questions, Mr. Jonas?

Mr. JONAS. No.

Mr. SIKES. I may not have a question on the item, but I would like a chance to brag about my constituent over there.

General ALLEN. Thank you, sir.

Mr. SIKES. We are glad to see the Marine Corps appreciates him as much as it does.

He has a new star on him every time he comes up here, Mr. Chairman. He deserves to have it, too.

Mr. SHEPPARD. As long as we are on the subject, General, how much time in your military capacity have you served in the great State of Florida?

General ALLEN. I was afraid that was going to come up, sir.

Mr. SIKES. The Californians have all the installations out there. There is no place for a man to serve in the Marine Corps in Florida.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would you mind answering my question? I would prefer to have the witness respond.

General ALLEN. I have not served any, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. So in reality while you come from a great State, you received your education in California to a degree; is that correct?

General ALLEN. I spent 22 years on the west coast and most of that was in California when I was in the continental United States.

Mr. SIKES. We are proud of him, Mr. Chairman, and we feel the years he spent doing mission duty in California was good for the country.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is a concession.

MARINE CORPS SUPPLY CENTER, BARSTOW, CALIF.

The next item has to do with the Marine Corps Supply Center at Barstow, Calif.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
MARINE CORPS SUPPLY CENTER	BARSTOW, CALIFORNIA	8373200

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. Over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
BARSTOW, 3 MILES WEST	SAN BERNARDINO	MARINE CORPS	11TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
SUPPLY DEPOT GENERAL	1943	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To procure, maintain, repair, store and distribute all classes of supplies and equipment as assigned.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JULY 1959	124	1,625	2,333	-	-	4,082
2. PLANNED - END FY 1963	135	1,765	2,376	-	-	4,276
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	135	1,765	2,376	-	-	4,276

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	PLANNED	ULTIMATE
	-	-	-

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	5,649	52,000	32,521,000	32,573,000
2. LEASED	-	(-)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Excepts Land Rent)		32,573,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				10,963,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				82,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				8,596,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				52,214,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY				AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11
451	LOADING AREA, YERMO	SY	0	8,000	0	8,000	82	0	82	82

153

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
NAVDOCKS 2570 (7-58) Supersedes NavDocks 4000

BOOK NO. II PAGE NO. 50

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Perliter & Soring, Los Angeles, Calif., at a fee of $1,310 and is complete.

The final plans and specifications are being completed by the district public works officer, Eleventh Naval District.

General, may I ask you, only finding a very small item here, does that mean you refuse to take into consideration the other requests you had emanating from the depot?

General ALLEN. No; that is not exactly it, Mr. Chairman. This comes in the order of priorities to place the shops into operation.

The shop, as you remember, was completely funded 2 years ago, and it will officially open. This will make the facilities around the shops completely usable for the vehicular traffic.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I can understand the requirement. I was recently on the base out there. I was under the impression they had made further request of the construction requirement aside from this.

General ALLEN. There have been other requests but they came in too late to get into our program. We do have some.

There is a total of about $10 million programed in the next 5 to 6 years for Barstow complex.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Within the budgeting for this year, this was the only one that came up?

General ALLEN. This was the only item we included ourselves in this program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions upon the item? The gentleman from Florida?

Mr. SIKES. No questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The gentleman on my left?

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

MARINE CORPS BASE, CAMP LEJEUNE, N.C.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall pick up the next item having to do with the Marine Corps Base at Camp Lejeune, N.C.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
MARINE CORPS BASE	CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA	8270175

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
JACKSONVILLE, 4-3/10 MILES NORTHWEST	ONSLOW	MARINE CORPS	5TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
TRAINING CENTER	1941	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To provide housing, training facilities, logistical support, and certain administrative support for Fleet Marine Force Units and other units assigned; to conduct specialized schools and other training as directed; to receive, process and conduct combat training as directed.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JULY 1959	335	3,958	2,598	2,665	25,587	35,143
2. PLANNED - END FY 1963	329	3,213	2,586	309	24,629	31,066
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	329	3,213	2,586	309*	24,629**	31,066

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	PLANNED	ULTIMATE
	-	-	-

* 40 OFF. - 269 EM

SECTION IV. INVENTORY ** 1,622 OFF. - 23,007 EM

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	109,046	1,620,000	114,941,000	116,561,000
2. LEASED	-	-	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Excess Land Rent)		116,561,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				5,605,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				433,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				40,917,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				163,516,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
724	BACHELOR OFFICERS' QUARTERS	MN	674 (602 SUBSTANDARD)	728	0	52	6,062	0	433	433

154

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by the public works officer, Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, N.C., and is complete. Final plans and specifications are being prepared by the same organization.

What are you using for bachelor officers' quarters now, and what will be done with these facilities if the new ones are constructed?

General ALLEN. This requirement is for 52, which is designed to serve the more senior officers. That is, the rank of major and above, that are not married, that are entitled to quarters. They are in quarters that are not considered adequate, or less than 450 square feet per man, two to a room. This will give each of the senior officers, majors and above, one room apiece, sharing a bath with another.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Those quarters for that rank, I assume, covers both Regular and Reserve officer requirement; is that correct?

General ALLEN. Reserve officers, in the summer when they are there are entitled to and will be quartered in those type quarters.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on the item, gentlemen?

Mr. SIKES. No questions.

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

MARINE CORPS RECRUIT DEPOT, PARRIS ISLAND, S.C.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, S.C.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
MARINE CORPS RECRUIT DEPOT	PARRIS ISLAND, SOUTH CAROLINA	8600610

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
SAVANNAH, GEORGIA, 75 MILES NORTH	BEAUFORT, HAMPTON	MARINE CORPS	6TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
RECRUIT TRAINING CENTER	1915	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To provide for reception and recruit training for enlisted personnel upon their first entry into the Marine Corps; to provide schools to train enlisted personnel in the administrative duties of a Sergeant Major, and as Administrative Chiefs, Recruiters, Drill Instructors and Field Musics; to conduct other schools as directed; to conduct reserve training as directed. To conduct rifle marksmanship training for Marine officer and enlisted personnel in the southeastern area and for personnel of other services as requested.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL		OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT	1 JULY 1959	238	2,279	721	246	3,985	7,469
2. PLANNED - END FY	1963	235	1,854	754	138	4,307	7,288
3. ULTIMATE - END FY	1963	235	1,854	754	138*	4,307*	7,288

NO. OF AIRCRAFT — PRESENT: - — PLANNED: - — ULTIMATE: -

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *ALL EM

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTAL ($)
1. OWNED	6,794	291,000	26,784,000	27,075,000
2. LEASED	22	(1,668) (Except Land Cost)	0	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959				27,075,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				7,541,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				1,455,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				12,860,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				48,931,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)				
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11	
722	RECRUIT BARRACKS	MN	672 (SUBSTANDARD)	675	900*	675	1,203	1,501	1,203	1,203	159
740	RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES CENTER	SF	18,272 (12,584 SUBSTANDARD)	12,360	0	12,360	252	0	252	252	182
								TOTAL	1,455	1,455	

*BARRACKS AT RIFLE RANGE

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA

DD FORM 2570 (7-58) Supersedes Previous edition

BOOK NO. II PAGE NO. 52

490

RECRUIT BARRACKS

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Lyles, Bissett, Carlisle & Wolff, Columbia, S.C., at a fee of $2,139, and is now complete.

On completion of preliminary engineering report review, final plans and specifications will proceed.

RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES CENTER

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Lyles, Bissett, Carlisle & Wolff, Columbia, S.C., at a cost of $1,390, and is now complete.

Final plans and specifications will be prepared by the same firm at a fee not yet determined.

You have two line items here. What are you using for recruit barracks now and what will be done with those facilities if the request is funded?

General ALLEN. If this request is funded, Mr. Chairman, a large number of quonset huts and Butler-type buildings, wartime temporary structures, will be demolished. The men are using those facilities now and this would permit replacement of them.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How long do troops occupy these barracks?

General ALLEN. These barracks are occupied by an individual about 2 weeks, but it is continually occupied by the rotation of the men to the rifle range and for their 2 weeks' firing period.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice you have a request here for a religious activities center. Do you have any chapels on the base now?

General ALLEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does this mean you will consolidate them? Just what do you mean by "religious activities center" as such?

General ALLEN. This is the offices for the chaplain; this is offices for the Navy Relief Society; offices that are operated on the base for the benefit of the men; Red Cross. It also provides an office or small room for the chaplain to interview men come in to be interviewed. This is not a chapel in itself. It is the services that go along with the chaplain and related services.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on the item, gentlemen?

Mr. SIKES. No questions.

Mr. JONAS. Do you have permanent-type barracks at the range for 900 men?

General ALLEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. This is to finish out the program to take care of the remaining 1,500 with similar barracks?

General ALLEN. That is right, sir.

Mr. JONAS. That is all.

MARINE CORPS BASE, CAMP PENDLETON, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next project has to do with Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, Calif.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
MARINE CORPS BASE, CAMP PENDLETON	OCEANSIDE, CALIFORNIA	8270551

4. NEARST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
OCEANSIDE .5 MILES SOUTH	SAN DIEGO	MARINE CORPS	11TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
MARINE CORPS BASE	1942	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To provide housing, training facilities, logistical support and certain administrative support for Fleet Marine Force units and other units assigned; to conduct specialized schools and other training as directed; to receive, process and conduct individual combat training as directed; to train and organize replacement units for shipment overseas as directed; and to provide logistical support to other Marine Corps activities as directed.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JULY 1959	282	3,401	1,912	3,761	25,528	34,884
2. PLANNED - END FY 1963	288	2,978	1,941	1,013	22,124	28,344
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	288	2,978	1,941	1,013•	22,124••	28,344

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT -	PLANNED -	ULTIMATE -

•8 OFF. - 1,005 EM

SECTION IV. INVENTORY ••1,432 OFF. - 20,692 EM

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS
1. OWNED	124,740	4,042,000	85,702,000	89,744,000
2. LEASED	-	(-)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		89,744,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				6,988,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				1,973,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				58,702,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				157,407,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)				
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11	
171	COMBAT TRAINING SCHOOL	SF	31,214 (SUBSTANDARD)	27,000	0	27,000	460	0	460	460	158
610	ADMINISTRATION BUILDINGS	SF	44,256 (SUBSTANDARD)	35,277	0	23,518	705	0	470	470	157
711	FAMILY HOUSING - CAPEHART	FA	4,676	1,252	0	400	-	-	-	-	
732	MESS HALLS	SF	37,521 (SUBSTANDARD)	54,405	0	36,270	1,268	0	845	845	156
822	HEATING SYSTEM, CAMP PHILLIPS (2ND INCR)	LF	0	4,440	0	4,440	198	0	198	198	155
								TOTAL	1,973	1,973	

COMBAT TRAINING SCHOOL

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Frank L. Hope & Associates, Los Angeles, Calif., at a fee of $3,645, and is complete.

Final plans and specifications are being prepared by the same firm at a fee of $24,233.

ADMINISTRATION BUILDINGS

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Frank L. Hope & Associates, Los Angeles, Calif., at a fee of $3,280, and is complete.

Final plans and specifications are being prepared by the same firm at a fee of $16,007.

MESSHALLS

The preliminary engineering report for this item is being prepared by Frank L. Hope & Associates, Los Angeles, Calif., at a cost of $6,625.

On completion of preliminary engineering report review, final plans and specifications will proceed.

HEATING SYSTEM, CAMP PHILLIPPS (SECOND INCREMENT)

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by district public works officer, 11th Naval District, and is complete.

Final plans and specifications are being prepared by district public works officer, 11th Naval District.

What is the water rights situation at Pendleton at the present time, gentlemen?

General ALLEN. The litigation is still in the courts. I think we are in a more favorable position than we have been before in that there is no spectacularism connected with it in forms of adverse publicity.

The judge of the court has contained the activities of the lawyers into line with the State law so that there are no problems that have developed between the court and the State.

I personally believe that there will be a judgment that will be acceptable to the services that is equity that will come out of the court within the next 12 months.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is the area in which these facilities are to be constructed concerned with the possible loss of water rights, if such was to occur?

General ALLEN. It has no relationship at all with jeopardy of our water rights.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the status of the barracks which were authorized here in previous years?

General ALLEN. Those barracks, I believe, go under contract or have gone under contract this quarter.

Admiral PELTIER. We will take bids the 5th of April, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Competitive bid?

Admiral PELTIER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for present training schools, messhalls, and administrative facilities here; and what will be done with these facilities if the new ones are funded?

General ALLEN. If the new facilities are funded, these old facilities will be torn down. The facilities that we now have there that we are using that are inadequate, that have long lived their life, are not being maintained except the bare minimum to keep the facility in operation. These will be destroyed. Some of them will have to be torn down, even before the new one is placed because of proper siting by the new facilities.

Ten of the old barracks, the oldest that were simply gone, unsafe as far as safety requirements were concerned, have been razed. They do not exist anymore.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You will have new buildings that will be in evidence when the new construction is finished. What is the policy within the Marine Corps for the rapidity of getting those old buildings completely out, by destruction, fire, et cetera? How much time does it take the Marine Corps to get those old buildings out of there?

General ALLEN. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that within 3 months after we moved into the buildings where we required them to provide a facility until the facilities were completed, within 90 days, that arrangements would have been concluded to raze these unsatisfactory, uneconomical-to-maintain buildings.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Marine Corps has always had a reputation of being pretty fast, and I hope that you exercise that same prerogative when it comes to elimination of buildings that you have no further use for.

Get them out and as fast as you can. The better it will be for everybody.

General ALLEN. We attempt to do that in every possible case.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on the item, gentlemen?

Mr. SIKES. No, thank you.

Mr. JONAS. Are these figures firm? This is $15.45 a square foot. That is agreeably low, it seems to me.

Admiral PELTIER. It is firm. That is our estimate, Mr. Jonas. It is a low figure.

Mr. JONAS. It is better than you are doing in comparable construction, is it not?

General ALLEN. I believe this is that tilt-up concrete that we have been most successful with in that particular part of the country. We have had contractors that have been very successful with it.

Mr. JONAS. Is this the complete cost?

Admiral PELTIER. Which one are you talking about, Mr. Jonas?

Mr. JONAS. I am talking about the school building.

Admiral PELTIER. Combat training school?

Mr. JONAS. Yes.

Admiral PELTIER. It is relatively low. It is lower than the DOD average.

Mr. JONAS. I was struck with it particularly because it is not just one building. It has a lot of classrooms in it. It must be cut up considerably. I was favorably impressed with that figure.

General ALLEN. We have had barracks where there was a very small amount of interior that was constructed as low as $11.

MARINE CORPS SCHOOL, QUANTICO, VA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item has to do with the Marine Corps School at Quantico, Va.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
MARINE CORPS SCHOOLS	QUANTICO, VIRGINIA	8680650

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
FREDERICKSBURG, 21 MILES SOUTH	PRINCE WILLIAM, FAUQUIER, STAFFORD	MARINE CORPS	POTOMAC RIVER NAVAL COMMAND

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
TRAINING	1917	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To train officers in the tactics and techniques of warfare, with particular emphasis on amphibious operations, in order to provide competent commanders and staff officers for air, ground and air-ground field forces of the Marine Corps. To develop, in coordination with appropriate specified agencies and representatives of the other services, the tactics, techniques and equipment employed by the landing forces in amphibious operations. To conduct other schools and to perform such other tasks as directed by the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JULY 1959	779	4,431	1,155	1,138	175	7,678
2. PLANNED - END FY 1963	648	4,350	1,177	1,769	-	7,944
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	648	4,350	1,177	1,769*	-	7,944

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	PLANNED	ULTIMATE
	-	-	-

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *1,637 OFF. - 132 EM

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS
1. OWNED	57,074	2,998,000	46,095,000	49,093,000
2. LEASED	-	-	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Excess Land Rent)		49,093,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				18,538,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				715,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				6,873,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				75,219,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY				AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11
171	RESEARCH LIBRARY	SF	2,545 (SUBSTANDARD)	19,900	0	7,000	589	0	210	210
171	COMBAT CONDITIONING FACILITY	SF	0	19,800	0	19,800	505	0	505	505
								TOTAL	715	715

160
183

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DAYBOOKS 2570 (7-58) Supersedes Facilities 4080

BOOK NO. II PAGE NO. 54

(See note on following page.)

301

RESEARCH LIBRARY

A preliminary engineering report for a larger facility was prepared by McGaughan & Johnson, Washington, D.C., at a fee of $6,289. and is now complete. The item as submitted is based on this preliminary engineering report but reduced in scope.

Upon revision and review of the preliminary engineering report, final plans and specifications will proceed.

COMBAT CONDITIONING FACILITY

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Bureau of Yards and Docks based on an earlier report by Lublin, McGaughy & Associates, Washington, D.C., and is now complete.

Final plans and specifications will be prepared by the same firm at a fee to be determined later.

There are two line items reflected here.

What are you using for a research library now and what will be done with these facilities if the new one is constructed?

General ALLEN. The present research library is part of the office building, office spaces for the school and the faculty.

They have been crowded up into other spaces and it was not space that was designed for a library. The initial plan was such that we could build or add to this building as the requirement developed. With the development of new techniques, new equipment, et cetera, the requirement for technical libraries has been much more requiring of the service. Here is an example of some of the space that is now used for technical libraries for the schools.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you consider this the most economical way to construct the library here?

General ALLEN. Yes, sir; I do. I think that this will give us a reasonable library with reading space, tables for layout of large charts and maps as well as good storage to properly identify for ease of location—technical manuals and technical material that is required in instruction.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you have a valid requirement—and I do not say you do not have—for additional space which you plan to request in future years why didn't you put it in one bundle and get it done with at this time? Don't you think that would be a better approach than later on expanding the facility?

General ALLEN. I am not familiar with the plans at the original construction, whether they were included or not.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you have any idea on that, Admiral?

Admiral PELTIER. This was submitted for a much larger space and was cut down.

General ALLEN. That was only this addition to the existing building that the chairman refers to, that it should have been included initially. My guess is, and I think it is reasonably valid, because I have tried to check this out some, that at the time we were talking about this school, we were not talking in the technology that we are talking in now or the changes of concepts or the requirements for history and other related subs that now become necessary upon the instruction and knowledge of the Military Manual of Techniques.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, what do you contemplate is the potentiality of additional requirements over and above what you are requesting herein, let's say the next 3 to 5 years? Do you figure you will have to have more space there?

General ALLEN. I do not believe there will be a requirement for the next 5 years. We have attempted to evaluate this in terms of that as the minimum time, but also the design of this is such that an extension, if required, could be placed with the minimum of cost at that time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What has occurred and how have you been getting along without a swimming pool and gymnasium at this particular station?

General ALLEN. This facility is being requested for the basic school, which is about 8 miles from the main center of Quantico. There is a swimming pool at the main center, but the classes and instruction are not as complete as we would like to conduct, and in the instruction which we do get, we have to transport these men from 9 miles out in to the swimming pool in the bay. There are no covered pools so winter training can be conducted. That is out. This will provide for that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Am I to interpret from your statement, General, that one of your pools will be retained for recreational and swimming aspects, and the other for training facilities?

General ALLEN. This primarily will be a training facility, because it will check out every second lieutenant who goes through there, that he is an adequate swimmer and is aware and trained in lifesaving.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What gymnasium facilities exist at Quantico now, either at the main station or at one of the adjacent or other camps?

General ALLEN. We have a very modest gymnasium program. There is one basketball court, and it has moderate other gymnasium facilities. There are no facilities at the basic school for gymnasium-type training or exercise or recreation for the men.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that the building which you normally use when you graduate the boys down there.

General ALLEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on the item?

Mr. SIKES. No questions.

Mr. JONAS. Why would you want to spend $26 a square foot for the building at Quantico when you can build this classroom at Pendleton for $15.45?

Admiral PELTIER. Mr. Jonas, there are quite a few vaults in this library for classified material. That runs the cost up considerably.

Mr. JONAS. It would not run it up $10 a foot, would it?

Admiral PELTIER. That is the estimate of our A. & E. It was worked out item by item.

Mr. JONAS. Is the general construction more elaborate? You have almost everything in the Pendleton building.

Admiral PELTIER. It has some additional costs. It is adjacent to Breckenridge Hall, and we will use brick veneer to match the existing construction. That will raise the cost some. It is mainly because of the classified nature of the material stored there which requires vaults.

Mr. JONAS. That is all.

MARINE CORPS RECRUIT DEPOT, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next is the Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, Calif.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
MARINE CORPS RECRUIT DEPOT	SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA	8600750

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
WITHIN CITY OF SAN DIEGO	SAN DIEGO	MARINE CORPS	11TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
TRAINING	1921	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To provide for reception and recruit training for enlisted men upon their first entry into the Marine Corps; to provide schools to train enlisted men for duty with ships' detachments, drill instructors, and field musics; to train personnel in fields of operational communications, communication material and electronics, and to conduct other schools as directed.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JULY 1959	299	2,383	395	1,431	4,200	8,708
2. PLANNED - END FY 1963	273	1,930	420	954	4,167	7,744
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	273	1,930	420	954*	4,167*	7,744

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT -	PLANNED -	ULTIMATE -

SECTION IV. INVENTORY * AT EM

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS
1. OWNED	1,027	354,000	19,880,000	20,234,000
2. LEASED	32	(-)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		20,234,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				322,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				73,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				27,715,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				48,344,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY				AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
171	COMMUNICATION-ELECTRONICS SCHOOL	SF	16,880 (13,164 SUBSTANDARD)	9,456	3,949	3,152	219	116	73	73

161

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by district public works officer, 11th Naval District, and is now complete.
Final plans and specifications are being accomplished by the same organization.

You have only one line item here, Communication-Electronics School. Give us a brief explanation of this requirement, please.

General ALLEN. This requirement is to bring the laboratory, classroom, and storage facilities into one building. This is crowded into several buildings which were not constructed for the purpose, and there is lack of proper power with the new types of equipment. I have examples of that here in the form of pictures showing the crowded activities of the students. This will provide correction of that situation. Here is an example of the students in one of the classrooms. This is enlisted training of our electronic operators for field work.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the seating capacity as shown here?

General ALLEN. As represented there, it is about 30.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are going to increase it to what?

General ALLEN. It will be increased probably not in a single classroom, but several classrooms of smaller numbers, making it much easier for the instructor to evaluate each student. It gives an opportunity for the equipments to be separated and not have mock-ups made for each separate class.

MARINE CORPS BASE, TWENTYNINE PALMS, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now let us pick up the Marine Corps Base at Twentynine Palms, Calif.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
MARINE CORPS BASE	TWENTYNINE PALMS, CALIFORNIA	8270800

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
TWENTYNINE PALMS, 6 MILES SOUTH	SAN BERNARDINO	MARINE CORPS	11TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
TRAINING	1952	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To provide housing, training facilities, logistical support and certain administrative support for Fleet Marine Force units and other units assigned; to conduct training as directed and to provide logistic support to other Marine Corps activities as directed.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JULY 1959	51	463	272	191	7,739	8,716
2. PLANNED - END FY 1963	51	357	278	-	4,716	5,432
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	51	357	278	-	4,716*	5,432

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	PLANNED	ULTIMATE
	-	-	-

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *335 OFF. - 4,411 EM

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS
1. OWNED	446,846	154,000	16,601,000	16,755,000
2. LEASED	65	(10,282)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Cost)		16,755,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				4,921,300
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				215,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				20,709,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				42,600,300

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)				
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
711	FAMILY HOUSING - CAPEHART	FA	864 (278 SUBSTANDARD)	467	150	150	-	-	-	-	
831	IMPROVEMENT TO SEWAGE SYSTEM	NA	-	-	-	-	125	0	125	125	163
841	WATER WELL	EA	4	1	0	1	90	0	90	90	162
								TOTAL	215	215	

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DAYBOOKS 2570 (7-58) Supersedes Foolbook 4000

BOOK NO. II PAGE NO. 56

506

IMPROVEMENTS TO SEWERAGE SYSTEM

The preliminary engineering report for this item is being prepared by Case & Gregory, Los Angeles, Calif., at a fee of $2,267.

Final plans and specifications will proceed on completion of preliminary engineering report review.

WATER WELL

The preliminary engineering report for this item is being prepared by Case & Gregory, Los Angeles, Calif., at a fee of $1,632.

Final plans and specifications will proceed on completion of preliminary engineering report review.

You have three line items here. The first is the family housing—Capehart, improvement to sewage system, and water well. What is the problem at Twentynine Palms with the sewer system?

General ALLEN. The amount of water or sewage affluent has to be increased. Because of the density of the sand, we do not get the filtration or the percolation into the ground, as well as replacement of some of the pipes. We have found that there is a tremendous amount of electrolysis out there, and there must be a change in the type of system that we use.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When the Navy went out there about a year or a year and a half ago, Admiral Peltier, as I recall it, you did do what I call spot trapping. That is my phraseology, but it may not be yours. You put down some electrolysis traps, pickups, call it whatever you may. I assume at that time that was done only for a certain section of the requirement compared to what is now required.

Admiral PELTIER. I am not familiar with that, Mr. Chairman.

General ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, at the outset, in order to conserve water we determined upon the use of the sewage affluent, pumping it back into the system for flushing. Because of the long, continuous warm weather, the bacterial count rose so fast it practically made it unbearable to use this water back in a system like that. This will correct that situation. That is part of the correction of the system. The idea was a good one when we started, but it would have worked better in a cooler climate.

Mr. SHEPPARD. As I understand, you are presently in negotiations with the operators on the Wherry housing project, is that correct?

General ALLEN. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How are you getting along with that situation? Does anybody here know?

Admiral PELTIER. I have heard no complaints.

General ALLEN. The negotiations have been opened. I am not sure of the progress. I have no report on the progress.

SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next category of projects is the Service School Facilities.

Please place the summary sheets for these projects in the record at this point.

(The summary follows:)

Service school facilities—Inside the United States

Installation and line item	Proposed funding	Fiscal year authorization
Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.: Rehabilitation of Bancroft Hall (1st increment).	$6,000,000	1961
Naval Supply Corps School, Athens, Ga.:		
Dispensary	133,000	1961
Acquisition of land	60,000	
Total	193,000	
Fleet Air Defense Training Center, Dam Neck, Va.:		
Classified item	815,000	1961
Barracks	669,000	1961
Total	1,484,000	
Naval Receiving Station, D.C.: Retrenchment of facilities	200,000	1961 amendment
Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill.:		
Recruit barracks (1st increment, 2d camp)	1,192,000	1960
Alteration to station entrance roads	125,000	1961
Total	1,317,000	
Fleet Sonar School, Key West, Fla.: Fleet Sonar School Building	1,002,000	1961
Fleet Air Defense Training Center, San Diego, Calif.: Classified item	727,000	1961
Naval Station, Washington Metropolitan area on Government-owned land:		
Modification to heliport	114,000	1961
Administration building	1,537,000	1961
Barracks	2,700,000	1961
Mess hall	2,533,000	1961
Bachelor officers' quarters with mess	1,567,000	1961
Brig	262,000	1961
Extension of utility systems	1,974,000	1961
Central heating plant	2,213,000	1961
Roads, walks, and parking areas	420,000	1961
Total	13,320,000	
Total service schools facilities:		
Unclassified items	22,701,000	
Classified items	1,542,000	
Total	24,243,000	

NAVAL ACADEMY, ANNAPOLIS, MD.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The first item is the Naval Academy.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL ACADEMY	ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND	7010 200

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTY/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
WITHIN THE CITY OF ANNAPOLIS	ANNE ARUNDEL	BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL	SEVERN RIVER NAVAL COMMAND

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
TRAINING OF MIDSHIPMEN	1845	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

Through study and practical instruction to provide midshipmen with basic education and knowledge of the naval profession; to develop them morally, mentally, and physically and by precept and example to indoctrinate them with the highest ideals of duty, honor, and loyalty in order that the naval service may be provided with graduates who are capable junior officers in whom have been developed the capacity and foundation for future development in mind and character leading toward a readiness to assume the highest responsibilities of citizenship and government.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	367	669*	1,567	3,600	0	6,203
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	367	669*	1,567	3,600	0	6,203
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1965	388	669*	1,567	3,800	0	6,424

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	PLANNED	ULTIMATE
	-	-	-

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	1,110	870,000	34,991,000	35,861,000
2. LEASED	17	(750)	836,000	836,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		36,697,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				25,792,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				6,000,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				35,409,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				103,898,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11
724	REHABILITATION OF BANCROFT HALL (1ST INCREMENT)	SF	1,126,000 (SUBSTANDARD)	-	-	391,827 (REHABILITATION ONLY)	17,000	0	6,000	6,000

*ENLISTED PERSONNEL ON NAVAL STATION ALLOWANCE

164

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DD FORM 2570 (7-58) Supersedes Previous Form

BOOK NO. II PAGE NO. 57

(See note on following page.)

53894—60—53

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by George M. Ewing Co., Washington, D.C., for a fee of $47,755 and is complete.

The final plans and specifications are being completed by the same firm, for a fee of $611,000.

Admiral CHEW. Mr. Chairman, the sixth class of facilities in the program is "Service school facilities." In this group there are 17 unclassified line items at 6 stations at a cost of $22,701,000 and 2 classified line items at separate stations, for $1,542,000. Only one of the line items was authorized prior to this year. The Bureau of Naval Personnel is responsible for the entry, indoctrination, training, administration, and well being of all naval personnel. The need for the projects in this program is to satisfy the minimum current requirements in the training of personnel in the full gamut of naval operations.

The first project is at the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., for rehabilitation of Bancroft Hall at the estimated cost of $6 million. This is the first of three planned increments for the major rehabilitation and modernization of Bancroft Hall. The basic structure, including basement and galley, was built in 1902 to 1906. Additional wings were built in 1918 and 1941. Two new wings for 1,100 midshipmen are now under construction. Large areas of the old flooring are worn out and require replacement. Condensation and leaky water pipes and connections have caused the plaster to fall off the walls and ceilings in numerous places. The water, steam heating, and electrical systems are old and deteriorated and cannot be made to give adequate service short of almost complete replacement. Although the building is structurally sound, considerable areas of the exterior walls, roofing, gutters, and adjoining paved surfaces need repairs. In summary, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the old portions of Bancroft Hall, a representative institution of education of the U.S. Government, is deplorably in need of major overhaul.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the total estimated cost for this job?

Admiral CHEW. The total estimated cost, Mr. Chairman, in three increments, is presently $17.740 million.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I was recently at the Naval Academy, and on the modification or rehabilitation which is going on, they are doing a pretty good job, much better than I expected to see done, because I do not have to tell you, Admiral Peltier, what they are up against on that job trying to modernize it. A pretty clean piece of workmanship is being done there.

Admiral PELTIER. Thank you.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Whoever your contractor may be at the moment, he happens to be the exception to the rule in modification of that type, because generally the job in itself, as you and I know, is a distasteful thing in the first place. When you have a contractor go in and do a workmanlike job on a job of that character, it is something to be grateful for, because they are hard to find in that field. That is a pretty tough problem.

What is the status of the plans for the proposed construction?

Admiral PELTIER. Mr. Chairman, we have made a preliminary engineering study of the complete project. We are commencing the final plans and specifications for the complete project. We will do that as a package. We will increment the construction over the next 3 years. We will bid in packages, $6 million for each of the first two

and a little less for the third. We hope to have final plans and specifications completed by next April.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What type of contract do you propose for this work?

Admiral PELTIER. It will be a lump-sum competitive bid type of contract.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let us hope that you get as good or better contract, if possible.

Admiral PELTIER. On the second increment, to match the first increment specialized items, we may ask for specific proprietary items. In other words, we like to get all our light fixtures, radiator heaters, and so forth, the same.

(Off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. What changes do you propose for the basement area in Bancroft, for example?

Admiral PELTIER. That has not been fully developed. It is still under discussion, Mr. Chairman. In our initial estimate when we had that up around $19 million, we had more work in the basement than is now contemplated. Most of the reduction in costs from that originally, has come from taking out some of the work in the basement. Until we develop the plan a little further, it would be hard to say just what we are going to do in that area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would give the committee some idea of the maintenance and operation savings which might be accomplished as a result of the work which is being done and that contemplated.

Admiral PELTIER. We will provide that for the record, Mr. Chairman.

(The information requested follows:)

Average annual maintenance cost, fiscal year 1942 through fiscal year 1959 (based on experience record, 1,125,000 square feet at 50 cents per square foot	$563,000
Estimated annual maintenance cost, fiscal year 1960 through fiscal year 1970 (based on nonapproval of fiscal year 1961 rehabilitation project and estimated 50 percent increase in average annual maintenance cost at 75 cents per square foot)	845,000
Estimated annual maintenance cost, fiscal year 1965 through fiscal year 1975 (based on accomplishment of fiscal year 1961 rehabilitation project and average annual maintenance cost at 20 cents per square foot)	225,000
Average annual saving in maintenance projected to 1975	620,000

NAVY SUPPLY CORPS SCHOOL, ATHENS, GA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next is the Navy Supply Corps School, Athens, Ga.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVY SUPPLY CORPS SCHOOL	ATHENS, GEORGIA	7869-060
4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	**5. COUNTY/COUNTRY**	**6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE**	**7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA**
ATHENS - WITHIN CITY	CLARKE	BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL	6TH NAVAL DISTRICT
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
SUPPLY CORPS TRAINING	1954	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To train officers in all aspects of disbursing and supply.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	47	80	61	430	1000	1618
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	47	80	61	430	1000	1618
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1965	47	80	61	500*	1100**	1788

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT -	PLANNED -	ULTIMATE -

* OFFICERS

SECTION IV. INVENTORY **MILITARY DEPENDENTS & RETIRED

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	40	80,000	2,508,000	2,588,000
2. LEASED		( )		0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		2,588,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				193,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				736,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				3,517,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11
550	DISPENSARY	SF	3,200 (SUBSTANDARD)	4,051	-	4,051	133	0	133	133 :184
911	ACQUISITION OF LAND	AC	40	18	-	18	60	0	60	60 :185
								TOTAL	193	193

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DAYDOCKS 2570 (7-54) Supersedes DD Form 4080

BOOK NO. II PAGE NO. 58

512

DISPENSARY

The preliminary study was prepared by the Bureau of Yards and Docks and has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and Assistant Secretary of Defense on February 10, 1960, for preparation of final plans and specifications subject to congressional actions with respect to the fiscal year 1961 MCON program. Final plans and specifications will be started immediately upon congressional approval. An A. & E. has not been selected and cost of the A. & E. work has not been determined.

ACQUISITION OF LAND

Two appraisals as required have been completed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for a dispensary at this facility at the present time, and what will be done with these facilities if the new ones are funded and constructed?

Admiral CHEW. Mr. Chairman, there is a temporary dispensary at the school at the present time. Actually, it is located on the first floor of the bachelor officers' quarters. That is the only dispensary facility. The space and layout of this dispensary naturally would be inadequate for the purpose. The only access to the two upper floors of the BOQ is through the dispensary. These inadequacies prevent the provision of proper medical care, perpetuate the hazard of cross-infection, interference with the proper control and administration of the dispensary and BOQ, and they utilize space which is urgently needed for bachelor officers' quarters. It is a makeshift arrangement, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What type of land is this which you propose to purchase here at a cost in excess of $3,000 per acre?

Admiral CHEW. The present site is 40 acres. We purchased the original land from the University of Georgia, and the additional land which we require is 18 acres which is adjacent to the site. This is also owned by the University of Georgia.

Actually, all the usable areas of the present site are allocated to various uses under the master plan. We haven't any space for requirements of athletic fields, intramural sports program, and construction of family housing for the teaching staff and the station personnel.

There is another aspect of it. The local concerns have expressed interest in acquiring this site for commercial or industrial uses, which could well be detrimental to Navy School's purposes. Officials of the university have acknowledged their appreciation of this situation, and have informally expressed their willingness for the Navy to acquire this land.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I say your sense of humor is slightly exaggerated, at least costwise.

Admiral CHEW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have a prior interest in Georgia Tech, but I did not think this situation could possibly exist in that great State.

(Off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the basis for the cost estimate you just referred to? Is it purely on an actual value concept, or is it really something different?

Mr. TIENCKEN. Mr. Chairman, we have two commercial appraisals on the property which show a figure of approximately $48,000 for the value of the land.

Admiral PELTIER. This was an estimate.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What consideration has been given to moving the Naval Supply Corps School to existing facilities at some other location and get out of this apparently rather high-cost area?

Admiral CHEW. I think in view of our investment there, any move of that nature, Mr. Chairman, would be more expensive than the money you would save.

Captain GAGE. Mr. Chairman, initially we invested, a little over $2 million for acquisition and development of this property which was purchased from the University of Georgia in 1953. Since that time we have put in another half million dollars.

Admiral CHEW. It is a total of about $2.5 million, present value, sir.

(Off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions, gentlemen?

Mr. JONAS. You say you did not build the existing facilities. You bought them already erected?

Captain GAGE. Yes, sir, the basic installation was purchased.

Mr. JONAS. On the 40 acres of land?

Captain GAGE. That is true. These facilities were part of a former girls' school. Since that time, Mr. Jonas, we have built a BOQ, a powerplant, and some family quarters. That is the extent of our construction.

Mr. JONAS. Where was this school conducted before you started operating in Athens?

Mr. KENYON. Bayonne, N.J.

Mr. JONAS. Why did we need another one?

Mr. KENYON. We were in inadequate facilities in Bayonne. We did not have enough space. We needed to find a place somewhere, and this property was available at the University of Georgia.

Mr. JONAS. We did not improve that situation much, though, did we, by going to Athens?

Mr. KENYON. No, sir, we did improve our situation by closing out our school in inadequate facilities in Bayonne and relocating the school to Athens.

Mr. JONAS. You are now having to buy additional land for $3,300 an acre.

Mr. KENYON. The Bayonne property, sir, was very inadequate. It would have taken much more than we spent at Athens to make adequate facilities available at Bayonne.

Mr. JONAS. Is this the only school of this type?

Captain GAGE. Yes, sir, the only one in the Navy. It trains all of our Supply Corps officers.

Mr. JONAS. Have you any married officers' quarters there now?

Captain GAGE. Yes, sir. There are 30 units for junior officers.

Mr. JONAS. In existence?

Captain GAGE. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. How many are proposed?

Captain GAGE. We have six for senior officers in a future program.

Mr. JONAS. That is all.

FLEET AIR DEFENSE TRAINING CENTER, DAM NECK, VA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we shall pick up the Fleet Air Defense Training Center, Dam Neck, Va.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
FLEET AIR DEFENSE TRAINING CENTER	DAM NECK, VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA	1300850
4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	**5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY**	**6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE**	**7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA**
NORFOLK, 20 MILES NORTHWEST	PRINCESS ANNE	BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL	5TH NAVAL DISTRICT
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
OPERATIONAL TRAINING FOR AIR DEFENSE	1942	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To provide operational training in all aspects of naval air defense, excluding guided missiles and associated control equipment, but including coordinated task group air defense at both ship and staff level and guided missile tactics as a part thereof, using devices, actual aircraft intercepts, and AA gunfire; to evaluate air defense tactics; to provide team training and, when required, operational maintenance training in CIC and gunnery equipments; to provide air intercept practice for fighter pilots of air groups temporarily based ashore in the Norfolk area, to provide logistic support for the U.S. Naval Guided Missiles Schools; to provide small arms and mortar range facilities for area Naval and Marine Commands; to conduct radar surveillance in connection with Continental Air Defense and hurricane tracking; and, as specifically directed, to provide support for Commander in Chief, U.S. Atlantic Fleet in emergencies.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL		OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT	1 JANUARY 1960	92	579	114	882	134	1,801
2. PLANNED - END FY	1961	120	631	114	1,418	284	2,567
3. ULTIMATE - END FY	1965	120	631	114	2,223*	284**	3,372

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	PLANNED	ULTIMATE
	-	-	-

*177 OFF - 2,046 EM

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

**36 OFF - 148 EM - 100 CIV.

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	1,073	69,000	12,634,000	12,703,000
2. LEASED	-	(-)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		12,703,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				1,484,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST (UNCLASSIFIED ITEM ONLY)				669,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				7,023,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				21,879,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
722	BARRACKS	MN	880	1,598	0	330	3,770	0	669	669
	CLASSIFIED ITEM			SEE CLASSIFIED BOOK						

118

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DAVDOCKS 2570 (7-58) Supersedes Previous Edition

BOOK NO. II PAGE NO. 59

(See note on following page.)

515

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by district public works officer, 5th Naval District, and is complete.

The preparation of final plans and specifications has been directed and will be accomplished by DPWO 5ND.

Why is it necessary to continue to increase the training load at this center instead of using some other facility where existing space is adequate or can be renovated for this type of work?

Admiral CHEW. Mr Chairman, this particular center is to take care of the increased load caused by the transition into the missile era. This is an expanded training requirement, particularly in guided missiles, in the POLARIS program, and in the complex area of the new Naval tactical data system, which is an electronic system. This has resulted in a considerable increase in the enlisted personnel loading. We have barracks there for 880 enlisted men right now, although there is a requirement for 2,480 due to this increased load. This leaves a deficiency of nearly 1,600 spaces.

Since all the school facilities for this type of training are located at Dam Neck, it is not feasible to utilize the existing berthing facilities which may be available at another distant activity. I am speaking specifically here, Mr. Chairman, of the possibility of utilizing barracks space at the amphibious base at Little Creek. But to transport them at this time for classroom work and training work would be completely unfeasible.

The proposed line item would provide barracks to accommodate 330 enlisted men as only the first increment of the requirement, which is a deficiency now of almost 1600 spaces, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you doing under site improvement? There is a line item on page 59a for this.

Admiral PELTIER. Roads and sidewalks, storm drainage, and grading and seeding.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the present status of the equipment for the classified facility which you propose to place at this location?

Admiral CHEW. Will you answer that, Captain Gage?

Captain GAGE. The equipment for the Navy tactical data system sir, is in process of being procured. It is the first item in the Bureau of Ships fiscal year 1961 electronics equipment program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on the item?

(No response.)

NAVAL STATION, WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA, D.C.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we shall pick up the Naval Station in the District of Columbia.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 2 MARCH 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL RECEIVING STATION 1/	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	5383900

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTY/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
WASHINGTON, D. C. - WITHIN CITY	-	BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL	POTOMAC RIVER NAVAL COMMAND

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
PERSONNEL LOGISTIC AND TRAINING	1942	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To receive, process, house, mess, clothe, pay and transfer transient personnel. To provide, when necessary and consistent with economy of operation, logistics support to other activities as may be prescribed by the District Commandant or the Chief of Naval Personnel.

1/ Redesignated Naval Station, Washington Metropolitan Area, on 21 May 1959.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	48	773	207	876	3,437	5,341
2. PLANNED - END FY 1960	48	773	207	1,070	3,544	5,642
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1961	48	773	207	1,070	3,544	5,642

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	PLANNED	ULTIMATE
	-	-	-

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	2	23,000	-	23,000
2. LEASED	82	21	9,293,000	9,293,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		9,316,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				650,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST		AMENDMENT ONLY		200,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				27,154,000
			7. GRAND TOTAL	37,320,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
720	RETRENCHMENT OF FACILITIES (AMENDMENT)	NA	-	-	-	-	850	650	200	200

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA

NAVDOCKS 2570 (7-58) Supersedes Revision of

BOOK NO. II PAGE NO. 59A

(See note on following page.)

167

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Daniel, Mann, Johnson, and Mendenhall, Washington, D.C., for a fee of $26,414 and is complete. The final plans and specifications have been completed by the same firm, for a fee of $31,654.

Admiral CHEW. The next line item is for funding the increased amount of $200,000 for Retrenchment of facilities at the existing Naval Receiving Station, Anacostia. The original authorization was granted in the fiscal year 1959 program by Public Law 85–685, and was approved for funding in the amount of $650,000. The purpose of that item was to close the ends of buildings which are to be truncated, and to relocate utilities which are to be moved, to make way for the construction of the Anacostia Freeway. These facilities will continue to be used until such time as the proposed new naval station becomes available. The temporary wood structures will then be razed and the land will be restored to the Department of the Interior. When the original estimate was made the Navy understood that the cost of demolition of the structures was to be borne by the District of Columbia as part of the cost of the freeway construction. It has since been established that the demolition is a responsibility of the Navy. The additional cost of $200,000 is for this express purpose.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Who made the decision that this cost was properly a Navy charge instead of a District of Columbia charge? Where was that determination and upon what premise, if you know?

Admiral CHEW. When the original estimate was made, Mr. Chairman, we understood the cost of the demolition of the structures was to be borne by the District of Columbia, in answer specifically to your question. Is that not correct?

Captain GAGE. Initially, yes, sir; it was understood in conversations with the representatives of the District Highway Department that they would demolish the buildings. Subsequently they indicated they would not demolish any buildings in the right-of-way, Mr. Chairman, so then it became incumbent upon us to do so.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Under existing law, it may be necessary for you to pursue that course, but let us go back to the legal basis. Where is the legal authority for this kind of operation? That is what motivated the question.

Admiral CHEW. I think we would have to furnish that for the record.

Captain GAGE. I will have to furnish that for the record, sir, because that determination was made by the legal people in Yards and Docks.

Admiral PELTIER. I have the information here.

Mr. TIENCKEN. This property was built under a permit for the land that was made available by the Department of the Interior. The terms of the permit did provide for restoration. We endeavored to get the road people to take on the burden of restoration when we were canceling that portion of the permit, and the road people have not accepted that burden.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Even though they have not accepted the burden, are you sure of your legal position here?

Mr. TIENCKEN. The permit does provide for restoration on the part of the Navy. That was a condition of our taking the property over originally.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If it was part of your original agreement, of course that creates a different situation. I did not know about that.

NAVAL TRAINING CENTER, GREAT LAKES, ILL.

Next we have the Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL TRAINING CENTER	GREAT LAKES, ILLINOIS	6373496

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
WAUKEGAN, ILLINOIS, 3 MILES NORTH	LAKE	BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL	9TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
NAVAL TRAINING	1906	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To provide basic indoctrination (recruit training) for enlisted personnel and primary, advanced and/or specialized training for officer and enlisted personnel of the regular Navy and the Naval Reserve.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	344	3,858	646	5,317	12,500	22,665
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	344	3,858	646	5,318	12,500	22,666
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1964	344	3,858	646	*4,940	**12,500	22,288

NO. OF AIRCRAFT — PRESENT – — PLANNED – — ULTIMATE –

* 130 OFF. - 4,810 EM

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

** RECRUITS

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	1,348	869,000	58,562,000	59,431,000
2. LEASED	–	(–)	–	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Cost)		59,431,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				22,458,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				125,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				82,450,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				164,464,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY				AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11
711	FAMILY HOUSING-CAPEHART	FA	2,296 (588 SUBSTANDARD)	1,283	425	250	–	–	–	–
722	RECRUIT BARRACKS (1ST INCREMENT 2ND CAMP)	MN	4,144 (SUBSTANDARD)	12,500	7,200	0	25,000	14,400	0	1,192
851	ALTERATIONS TO STATION ENTRANCES AND ROADS	NA	*	*	–	*	125	0	125	125
								TOTAL	125	1,317

* Alterations required by NEW STATE HIGHWAY.

165

166

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA

NAVDOCKS 2570 (7-58) Supersedes NavExos 4080

BOOK NO. II PAGE NO. 60

D-5020

520

RECRUIT BARRACKS (1ST INCREMENT, 2D CAMP)

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by District Public Works Officer, 9th Naval District and is complete.

The preparation of final plans and specifications has been directed and will be accomplished by DPWO 9ND.

ALTERATIONS TO STATION ENTRANCE ROADS

An engineering study is being prepared by H. W. Lockner, Inc., Chicago, Ill., for a fee of $1,700.

The preparation of the final plans and specifications has been directed and upon completion of the engineering study will be accomplished by the same firm. The cost of the A. & E. work has not been determined.

Admiral CHEW. The fourth project is for 2 line items at the estimated cost of $1,317,000 at the Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill. This Center provides basic recruit training, and primary, advanced, and specialized training for officer and enlisted personnel of the regular Navy and the Naval Reserve.

The first line item is for construction of the remaining portion of the first increment of recruit barracks for the second camp at the estimated cost of $1,192,000. The complete line item for 3 barracks buildings to accommodate 2,160 enlisted men was authorized last year in Public Law 86-149 in the amount of $4,442,000. However, the Appropriations Committees of Congress last year approved the construction of only 2 barracks for berthing 1,440 enlisted men plus the supporting utilities for the complete increment at the estimated cost of $3,250,000. This year we are requesting committee approval for construction of the third barracks for accommodating 720 enlisted men. The second camp is needed, like the first camp, to replace the old, unsafe, wood barracks, hurriedly built in World War II of inferior construction and materials.

The second line item is for alterations to station entrances and roads at the estimated cost of $125,000. State Highway Route 42 borders the main station area and is the principal access road to the reservation. The highway carries a heavy volume of traffic, making the present ongrade station entrances from the road extremely hazardous. The State is now planning to improve the road to a four-lane divided highway. These plans incorporate training center recommendations for location and design of grade separation structures for local traffic interchange which will permit grade-separated station entrances. This will require onstation road alteration and construction to connect these grade separations. The new State constructed grade separation ramps will not be completely functional with the existing roads until completion of this line item. It will be impracticable to use the two present entrance roads after the new highway is built.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the total estimated cost of the second camp here?

Captain GAGE. I have that broken down, sir, and will have to add it up. May I supply it?

Mr. SHEPPARD. You may supply that for the record.

Captain GAGE. I have it in two increments and several categories.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When the record comes down, insert that.

Captain GAGE. Yes, sir. It is approximately $16 million.

(The information requested follows:)

Cost of second recruit camp Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill.

First increment: Three 720-man recruit barracks (authorized in fiscal year 1960 by Public Law 149–86)	$4, 442, 000
Second increment:	
Four 720-man recruit barracks	6, 498, 000
One 252-man staff barracks	
Dispensary to serve both new camps	2, 268, 000
Recruit classroom building	1, 277, 000
Mess hall (Five 292-man capacity)	2, 459, 000
Total cost	16, 944, 000

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would insert in the record the recruit training load for this camp for the past 5 years, and the estimate for fiscal year 1961.

(The information requested follows:)

Recruit training load at Naval Training Center, Great Lakes

Fiscal year	Average on board recruit load	Peak load
1956 [1]	11, 883	16, 457
1957 [1]	6, 142	10, 841
1958 [1]	7, 792	12, 238
1959	9, 177	14, 887
1960 (estimated)	10, 328	15, 475
1961 (estimated)	9, 939	14, 129

[1] Naval Training Center, Bainbridge was in operation up to December 1957.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Also insert in the record your reenlistment rate for the past 5 years, and what you estimate for fiscal year 1961, as well.

(The information requested follows:)

Reenlistment rate

[Percent]

Fiscal year	1st term [1]	Career [2]	Overall
1956	11.5	94.3	32.6
1957	15.6	85.8	44.9
1958	22.6	89.0	43.7
1959	23.4	90.1	34.3
1960	23.6	92.0	36.1
1961 (estimated)	25.6	87.2	44.1

[1] 1st term reenlistment: An individual who has completed an initial enlistment contract in the Regular Navy.

[2] Career reenlistment: An individual reenlisting for a 2d or subsequent term of service in the active forces of the U.S. Navy.

NOTE.—Fluctuations caused by a variety of factors are experienced in reenlistment rates. A principal cause is the fluctuation in the numbers eligible to reenlist. For example, the following tabulation shows the numbers of first term personnel who actually reenlisted or are expected to reenlist:

Fiscal year—	*Number 1st term reenlistments*
1956	15,452
1957	10,042
1958	13,957
1959	18,199
1960	18,715
1961 (estimated)	16,775

It will be noted from the above that a higher reenlistment percentage does not always mean a greater number of actual reenlistments. The number of 1st-term reenlistments is barely sufficient to maintain the currently inadequate career contingent of enlisted personnel. A substantial increase in the number of 1st-term reenlistments, up to 20,000–24,000 annually, would gradually increase the size of the career segment of the Navy. This is an urgent requirement. However, even with this much more favorable number of reenlistments, a period of about 16 years would need to elapse before the career contingent could be built up to the required level. At that time, the number of new personnel required to enter the Navy could be expected to diminish. Until the above favorable conditions (1st-term reenlistments in excess of 20,000 annually over a protracted period) are obtained, it must be assumed that annual intake of recruits will approximate that of the past few years. This has averaged about 90,000 annually. This will require an average recruit trainee load at Great Lakes of about 10,000 with peak loads running as high as 15,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you presently using for barracks at this installation, gentlemen?

Captain GAGE. At Great Lakes, Mr. Chairman, we presently are using the first new camp previously authorized and funded by the Congress. This new camp is for about 5,000 men. The remainder of the recruits are being housed in the old World War II "firetraps," as we call them, with which I am sure you are familiar. The second camp, which was initiated with the authorization and funding of last year, when completed, will provide total capacity for slightly over 10,000 recruits in two new camps. This will be sufficient for our foreseeable needs.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would insert a barracks inventory in the record similar to the one we had inserted in the record last year, will you, please?

Captain GAGE. I will be glad to do that, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

Barracks inventory, Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill.

Use	Number of buildings	Type	Condition	Capacity per building (men)	Total capacity
Staff personnel	1	Permanent	Adequate (new)	252	252
	3	do	Adequate	188	564
	1	do	do	176	176
	11	Temporary	Substandard	158	1,738
	4	Semipermanent	Adequate	126	504
	1	Temporary	Substandard	123	123
	5	do	do	120	600
	1	do	do	105	105
	1	do	do	90	90
	2	do	do	80	160
	1	do	do	79	79
Subtotal	31				4,391
Service school	1	Permanent	Adequate (new)	2,000	2,000
Students	25	Temporary	Substandard	158	3,950
Subtotal	26				5,950
Recruits:					
1st new recruit camp	7	Permanent	Adequate (new)	720	5,040
2d new recruit camp	[1] 3	do	do	720	2,160
	[2] 19	Temporary	Substandard	148	2,812
Subtotal	29				10,012
Marines	1	Permanent	Adequate	172	172
	1	Temporary	Substandard	126	126
Subtotal	2				298
Grand Total	88				20,651

[1] Not yet built. Construction contract to be awarded within 30 days.
[2] 7 of these temporary barracks will be demolished to make site available for the 2d increment of new construction.

FLEET SONAR SCHOOL, KEY WEST, FLA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we shall consider the Fleet Sonar School, Key West, Fla.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
FLEET SONAR SCHOOL	KEY WEST, FLORIDA	7383500

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTY/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
WITHIN THE CITY OF KEY WEST, FLORIDA	MONROE	BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL	6TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
TRAINING FOR ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE	1940	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To train personnel in the tactical aspects of anti-submarine warfare and in the operational and tactical use of SONAR, ASW weapons and allied equipments and in the manipulation, and operational, preventive, and technical maintenance of SONAR and allied equipments in order to provide for the most effective accomplishment of the anti-submarine and submarine warfare tasks.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	51	236	0	975	0	1,262
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	51	250	0	1,026	0	1,327
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	51	250	0	1,028*	0	1,329

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	PLANNED	ULTIMATE
	-	-	-

SECTION IV. INVENTORY * 128 OFF - 900 EM

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	0*	0	2,211,000	2,211,000
2. LEASED	-	(-)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959 (Excess Land Rent)				2,211,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				1,002,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				0
*TENANT ACTIVITY OF U.S. NAVAL BASE, KEY WEST, FLA.			GRAND TOTAL	3,213,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
171	FLEET SONAR SCHOOL BUILDING	SF	111,820	43,046	0	43,046	1,002	0	1,002	1,002

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
NAVDOCKS 2570 (7-58) Supersedes Revision of 1-60

BOOK NO. II PAGE NO. 61

(See note on following page.)

53984—60—36

525

39

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Weed, Johnson, Associates, Miami, Fla., for a fee of $12,174, and is complete.

The preparation of final plans and specifications has been directed and will be accomplished by the same firm. The cost of the A. & E. work has not been determined.

Admiral CHEW. The fifth project is for construction of a fleet sonar school building, at the estimated cost of $1,002,000, at the Fleet Sonar School, Key West, Fla. The mission of the school is to train personnel in the tactical aspects of antisubmarine warfare and in the operational and tactical use of sonar, ASW weapons and allied equipment; and in the manipulation and maintenance of these devices and equipment. The greatly accelerated development and installation rate of new ASW equipment and the increasing complexity of new sonars and associated fire control systems have generated a need for additional building space. Also, requirements for training personnel to operate and maintain the equipment have increased the workload of the school far beyond the present capability. This project will provide the school with the additional space required for classrooms and installation of surface ship, submarine, airborne and landbased sonars and ASW fire control systems which will be required in fiscal year 1962 and subsequently for training in the vital ASW field.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for a sonar school at this location at the present time?

Admiral CHEW. We presently have sonar school facilities, Mr. Chairman, but, as you know, the greatly accelerated development in installation rate of the new ASW equipment and the increasing complexity of the new sonars and associated fire-control systems have generated a need for additional building space. Also, requirements for training personnel to operate and maintain the equipment have increased the workload of the school far beyond its present capability.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this been surveyed, Admiral, on the premise that it could not be located anyplace else and nothing else is available?

Admiral CHEW. This project has been surveyed, Mr. Chairman, but there are other considerations. For example, this is an ideal training area for our submarine crews. This is where we have conducted our sonar training in the past. It is also, as I suggested, where the ships and the equipment are located. This is purely an expansion of the existing facility rather than to go ahead and try to relocate it somewhere else.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What other training facilities do you have for your antisubmarine warfare?

Admiral CHEW. The comparable west coast training would be at San Diego. There is a sonar school in San Diego similar to this on the east coast, and there are limited facilities at Pearl Harbor. This is the east coast center of sonar training as San Diego would be for the west coast, with limited facilities at Pearl, sir.

NAVAL STATION, WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA, D.C.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we come to another project for the Naval Station in the District of Columbia.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL STATION	WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA	1452076

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTY/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
WASHINGTON, D. C.	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA - CONTIGUOUS COUNTIES	BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL	POTOMAC RIVER NAVAL COMMAND

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
PERSONNEL LOGISTICS AND TRAINING	1943	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To receive, process, house, mess, clothe, pay, and transfer personnel. To provide, when necessary and consistent with economy of operation, logistics support to other activities as may be prescribed by the District Commandant or the Chief of Naval Personnel

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	48	773	207	876	3,437	5,341
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	48	773	207	1,070	3,544	5,642
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1966	48	773	207	1,070	3,544	5,642

NO. OF AIRCRAFT Helicopters — PRESENT 5 — PLANNED 5 — ULTIMATE -

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	306	1,485,000	12,850,000	14,335,000*
2. LEASED	18	(-)	24,000	24,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Lease Rent)		14,359,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				-
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST ~~INCLUDING AMENDMENT~~				13,320,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				12,443,000
*PLANT ACCOUNT FOR NAS, ANACOSTIA			7. GRAND TOTAL	40,122,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION			PHYSICAL CAPACITY				AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11	
141	MODIFICATION TO HELIPORT	SF	51,500	1,000	-	1,100	114	-	114	114	168
610	ADMINISTRATION BUILDING	SF	70,701	63,843 (SUBSTANDARD)	-	63,843	1,537	-	1,537	1,537	169
~~720~~	~~RETIREMENT OF FACILITIES (AMENDMENT)~~	~~NA~~					~~850~~	~~850~~	~~200~~	~~200~~	~~167~~
722	BARRACKS	MN	3,597	3,500	-	1,500	6,485	-	2,700	2,700	169a
723	MESS HALL	SF	98,863 (SUBSTANDARD)	62,962	-	62,962	2,533	-	2,533	2,533	169b
724	BACHELOR OFFICERS' QUARTERS WITH MESS	MN	374 (SUBSTANDARD)	300	-	150	1,567	-	1,567	1,567	169c

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA

NAVDOCKS 2570 (7-58) Superseded Sandwa 4080

BOOK NO. II PAGE NO. 62

D-2030

Admiral CHEW. The final unclassified project is for the naval station in the Washington metropolitan area on Government-owned land for an estimated cost of $13,320,000. This project is needed as a replacement for the existing naval receiving station at Anacostia which is in the path of progress of the construction of the freeway. The portion of the existing station which will not be occupied by this modern highway is to be cleared and restored to its previous use as a park. In planning for the naval station, the Navy envisioned the utilization of the existing Government-owned facilities, built up and improved by the Navy over the years, at the Naval Air Station, Anacostia. Availability of certain existing facilities, minimum costs, distance from places of work at the Pentagon and Navy Annex for the majority of personnel involved were several of the factors apparently favorable to selection of this site. The estimates of cost for the nine line items in this project have been made on the basis of this initial plan, with consideration having been given to maximum use of existing facilities. If it be determined that another Government-owned site is more feasible for use, the estimates would, naturally, have to be restudied. The project also includes a line item for an increased amount for Retrenchment of facilities at the existing Naval Receiving Station.

The following nine line items would be required as the first increment to meet the requirements at the present Anacostia Naval Air Station:

1. Heliport modifications, $114,000: This item is needed for construction of a passenger terminal and of paving to connect the east end of the runway with the parking apron. The helicopter unit now assigned to the station provides special security and emergency service to the Defense Department and other Government agencies. Upon completion of the Dulles International Airport, this centrally located facility can serve as the arrival point of American and foreign dignitaries who land at Dulles Airport.

2. Administration building, $1,537,000: Office space is required for the command, administration, and operation of the station. Space is also required for the medical, dental, and logistic support of the personnel. This activity serves as the central point in Washington for personnel, legal, supply and Navy exchange matters. The proposed line item will provide the space where these necessary and important functions are to be carried out.

3. Barracks, $2,700,000: The two existing buildings used for berthing enlisted men are fire hazards. One of these is a multipurpose brick building in which enlisted men are berthed on the second and third floors. The other is a temporary, wood barracks building planned for demolition when suitable substitute facilities are available. These two structures have bunking capacity of 1,523. The proposed new barracks would have space for 1,500 men, including station forces, transients, students at the several schools to be located at the station and enlisted men serving at several nearby activities.

4. Messhall, $2,633,000: Approximately 3,500 enlisted personnel will be residing at the naval station. The existing facilities are in two buildings. One of these is the multipurpose building I mentioned previously, which has a seating capacity of 200; the other is a tem-

porary, wood structure with seating capacity of 300. This wood building is also a fire hazard which should be razed whenever adequate facilities are built. The proposed messhall will have a seating capacity of 1,600, which, based on 2.5 seatings per meal, would provide a nominal capacity for 4,000 personnel.

5. Bachelor officers' quarters with mess, $1,567,000: BOQ space with mess facilities is required for station bachelor officers, students at the Naval Intelligence School and transients, including reservists on active duty. Occupancy of the BOQ at the receiving station varies between 200 to 300 throughout the year. A small BOQ exists at the air station which houses transient flight personnel. The proposed BOQ and mess will accommodate 150 officers.

6. Brig, $262,000: The only brig in the area is at the naval receiving station. Major activities utilizing the brig services includes the Naval Air Station, Patuxent River; Naval Air Station, Anacostia; Naval Security Station, Naval Communication Station, Marine Barracks, Henderson Hall, and the Naval Weapons Laboratory, Dahlgren. It serves as a place of confinement for prisoners sentenced to less than 2 months, as a receiving and shipping point to Retraining Command, Portsmouth, N.H., and for prisoners confined for safe keeping. The proposed brig will have a capacity for 75 men.

7. Utilities extension, $1,974,000: Existing water, sewerage, steam, electric, and street lighting system have the capacity of serving less than 50 percent of the facilities required for the naval station. Under the proposed plan, these utilities would be extended or enlarged to provide adequate service for the naval station.

8. Central heating plant, $2,213,000: The station now has three separate heating plants, not the steam requirement. The main plant is nearly 40 years old and has practically served its usefulness. The proposed single central heating plant would provide the most economical operation. The two South Capitol Street side plants would be retained for standby use.

9. Roads, walks, and parking area, $420,000: Efficient design of the station makes maximum use of existing roads, and walks, including use of aircraft runways. Approximately 94 percent of existing pavements are planned for re-use. The proposed line item provides for only minimum additional roads, walks and parking area to give access to the new facilities.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This proposal is necessary, according to the Navy, as a result of the proposed Anacostia freeway curtailing the present activities at the Naval Station in Anacostia.

In fiscal year 1959, the Navy requested and the Congress approved $650,000 for retrenchment plans at the Anacostia Station, including demolition of buildings, construction of new enclosures, modification of utilities, security fence, and other items. What has been done with the funds to date?

Captain GAGE. That money has not been obligated, Mr. Chairman, because the highway construction has not yet commenced. The latest information received from the Highway Department states that they now plan to commence construction early in 1962. This is the latest information, as of February 3d. We have had no requirement to spend this money to date, and we hope we will not have to spend all of

it by being relocated, in some degree, at the Naval Air Station prior to that time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What do you propose to use these funds for, the $650,000 to which I previously referred?

Captain GAGE. If we have not relocated activities prior to the time the highway construction actually commences, Mr. Chairman, we will need to use that money to replace the utilities and alter facilities which will be in the demolition zone of the freeway. There are many buildings which will be involved, either wholly or partially.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are planning now to use these for buildings, or just for power facilities?

Captain GAGE. Both, Mr. Chairman. The steam supply and the electrical distribution units both will be affected by the demolition, and we plan to repair buildings partially demolished, mostly barracks.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is the committee's understanding that this project has been revised several times, largely due to the desires of the National Capital Planning Commission. I wish you would please explain in detail for the committee, the Navy plan as presented to the National Capital Planning Commission and the decision of the Commission as reflected in the proposal before the committee at the present time.

Admiral PELTIER. The proposal we have for this, Mr. Chairman, has been approved by the National Capital Planning Commission.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What was the Navy's original proposal?

Admiral PELTIER. The Navy's original proposal was to use the whole area, Mr. Chairman, 300 acres. That was not acceptable to the Department of Defense, and this now has been reduced down to where we are using 95 acres here, and 30 acres here [indicating].

Mr. SIKES. Will you indicate which area is to be released?

Admiral PELTIER. It is this area here [indicating].

Mr. SIKES. Does this not interfere with the freeway? There is no conflict with the freeway on this plan?

Captain GAGE. No, Mr. Sikes, there is no real conflict with the freeway. The freeway runs generally parallel to the property. There is some conflict with interchanges, that is all.

Admiral PELTIER. They do have in one of their proposals a freeway coming down in here [indicating], and going eventually across, but that is probably 20 years away. That is in one of the proposals that they showed us.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is our understanding, Admiral Peltier, that in reconsideration, the Navy had its own proposals which they made to the National Capital Planning Commission. What were your proposals to the Commission as compared with what is now before us?

Admiral PELTIER. Our proposal had, in addition to what we have here, certain areas set aside for housing. We made use of the existing pavement for parking area to a greater extent than we have here. In other words, we have been squeezed down, so to speak, in this plan from what we originally proposed, by not including certain facilities such as housing in this present plan.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In making this decision, what consideration would you say was given to the plans of the Department of Defense? Is the question clear?

Admiral PELTIER. I did not quite understand.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In making this decision, what consideration was given to the plans of the Department of Defense?

Admiral PELTIER. The National Capital Planning Commission did discuss and negotiate with the Department of Defense on this. There was a series of meetings between our planning people and the National Capital Planning Commission people. We finally worked down to a plan which is acceptable to both. We had to reduce this, I think, to the irreducible minimum. It is really down to the bone. There are certain areas which I think will have to be returned. As you will see from this plan, Mr. Chairman, their line comes right up to this corner, and it does not give us enough room to go across here. We will have to ask them to give us this little extra here. We do not have room for a chapel, gym, CPO clubs, things which may be required in the future. We will have to negotiate that out with them.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You intend to do that, in other words, as a part of the agreement with the Commission, so you will not later find yourself "over a barrel," as it were?

Admiral PELTIER. I hope we can, yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now would be the time to do it, would it not?

Admiral PELTIER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are the building foundation conditions in this area, and how do the costs of special foundations here compare to that normally found at other locations and those in the area of the original Navy proposal?

Admiral PELTIER. The area of the Naval Air Station, Anacostia, is on an alluvial fill. It requires piling. Both plans would require a considerable amount of extra foundation cost. We feel this is running somewhere around 10 to 12 percent additional cost for foundations. The north end, which is where we are locating, which to us is the most desirable end from the standpoint of accessibility to the city of Washington and all that, has probably the more serious foundation problems, but the use of existing facilities in this area that we can make use of will offset some of the additional foundation costs.

NEED FOR HELICOPTER FACILITIES

Mr. SHEPPARD. One of the approval conditions of the Commission was the removal of the existing helicopter facilities and a request that, pending the feasibility of the moving of these facilities, no new construction or renovation of existing facilities would take place on that portion of Anacostia Naval Air Station south of building No. 72. What are you doing about this, and how does this condition relate to your present proposal?

Admiral PELTIER. May I go off the record there?

(Off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to have that on the record as a matter of commitment for the record.

(The information requested follows:)

The need for the helicopter facilities at the Naval Station, Anacostia is to satisfy the requirements of the White House and the executive department. For this reason the heliport must be within short driving distance from the White House. The letter following confirms that the heliport is to remain at the Naval Air Station, Anacostia. This has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and the National Capital Planning Commission.

MARCH 30, 1960.

Hon. HARLAND BARTHOLOMEW,
Chairman, National Capital
Planning Commission

DEAR MR. BARTHOLOMEW: Reference is made to your letter of March 14, 1960, concerning the plans for the future utilization of the Anacostia-Bolling complex.

In regard to resolution (1), it is our understanding that adjustment of the boundaries of the sites specified on NCPC Plan No. 37.1–59 is subject to reconsideration by the Commission at our request, dependent upon final engineering plans for this facility.

Concerning resolution (2), this office has made further investigation and has determined that the heliport facilities must remain as they presently exist. Gen. A. C. Welling, Engineer Commissioner, District of Columbia, can furnish the Commission the details leading to this determination. In view thereof, it is requested that resolutions (2) and (3) be withdrawn in order that we may plan for the retention and use of some of the existing buildings in area B to meet requirements such as public works, publication center, heating plant, and supply and storage. Present plans are to rehabilitate buildings for these uses at a cost of $736,000 as against a replacement cost of $5,500,000.

It is to be particularly noted that the extra costs of locating at Anacostia in the original plan presented by the Department of the Navy were considered of major importance and that these costs were one of the basic reasons this office requested that the plan be revised to construct on the southern portion of the Anacostia-Bolling complex.

It is believed advisable and in accord with the desires of your staff to have preliminary discussions before a firm plan is proposed for the future use of the present Bolling Air Force Base. Such discussions will be initiated at an early date.

Sincerely yours,

(S) FLOYD S. BRYANT.

Mr. SIKES. Before you leave that subject, I would like to ask a question. What is the requirement for a helicopter facility at that location?

Admiral CHEW. The helicopter facility is required as a defense measure, and the nature of the classified information——

(Off the record.)

Mr. SIKES. Is there any other reason for the location of the helicopter facility in this area?

Admiral CHEW. You have the existing facility there now, sir.

Mr. SIKES. I am asking what is the requirement for the facility there? You gave me the answer, the convenience of the White House. Is there any other reason?

Captain GAGE. There is a further requirement which relates to the basic requirement, sir.

Mr. SIKES. What is that?

Captain GAGE., That is the need to be at the closest possible point to the White House.

Mr. SIKES. It all gets back to having it located there for the convenience of the White House. Is that correct?

Admiral CHEW. That is correct.

Mr. SIKES. I have no desire to deprive the White House of that convenience, but I do want to determine if there are other facilities that could be used. It seems this is an awkward location for this facility except for this purpose; otherwise you would not have it there. Is that right?

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have a capability of taking care of these helicopters on the project presently under discussion?

Admiral CHEW. For the operational aspects; yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What about the maintenance?

Admiral CHEW. They are rotated for the actual maintenance. These are the ready helicopters. They are standing there ready to go and they have been maintained by the Marines at Quantico; the Army maintains theirs at Belvoir. This is for the actual maintenance and repair of helicopters similar to an air station where you would go for repairs.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That type of procedure insofar as the repair aspect is one that has been followed ever since you have had the helicopters, is that right?

Admiral CHEW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What about the housing for the personnel?

Captain GAGE. Berthing for the personnel involved is available right there.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is available right there?

Captain GAGE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. How large is this operation? How many people are maintained at Anacostia in connection with the helicopter operation?

Admiral CHEW. I would have to supply that for the record. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SIKES. I would like to know something about the personnel required there.

Captain GAGE. Ten officers and 44 men, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Supply for the record the cost of this operation.

Admiral CHEW. Yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

Cost to Naval Air Station, Anacostia in support of helicopter operation . . . $20,650.

Mr. SIKES. Do you have facilities there for maintenance as well as operation if it were decided that you would want to use maintenance facilities in addition to operation facilities?

Admiral CHEW. I would say that the present capability—and I would have to supply the details for the record—there is limited maintenance performed there of an emergency type by virtue of the fact there is presently an air facility and an air station. Major repairs would not be accomplished there.

Captain GAGE. Whenever the helicopters are there they would be fully operational. If they required repairs they would be immediately replaced. If one even coughed on starting, they would get another one there immediately to replace it.

Mr. SIKES. What would be the effect of the transfer of other operations to Andrews?

Admiral CHEW. The fixed wing air operations will transfer to Andrews, sir.

Mr. SIKES. This is the only flight operation that will be left?

Admiral CHEW. This is the only flight operation that will be left; yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Is it planned to leave the operational and maintenance capability at Anacostia for helicopters?

Admiral CHEW. I would have to supply for the record just what repair facilities are planned.

Captain HALL. Operational only, sir.

Admiral CHEW. As I indicated, from the limited facilities there it would be of an emergency nature only, I am sure.

Mr. SIKES. That is all.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I believe your plan is to make maximum use of existing utilities systems on this area. What effect has the decision of the National Capital Planning Commission had on your ability to use existing storm drainage and sanitary sewerage or other utilities of like character?

Admiral PELTIER. The overall project as originally planned did require additional storm drainage, sewage, and water distribution lines. This present plan also requires extension of our steam lines. Overall it will probably reduce the cost because we are in a more confined area, but we are making maximum use of the facilities in the area such as the existing taxiway and runway, which will be used to the maximum extent possible for parking.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The utilities are in the same category that you have just referred to?

Admiral PELTIER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This has to be done even under the plan you are proposing?

Admiral PELTIER. Yes. Our heating plant is the source and you have to run your steam lines out regardless of where you are located.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does your estimate reflect complete replacement or construction of new facilities in the north end of this area?

Admiral PELTIER. This estimate is not completely engineered to this particular site, but the rough check we have made on it does cover the cost of the utilities for this north end.

Mr. SHEPPARD. On my previous question I do not think I got an answer to your ability to use existing storm drainage and sanitary sewerage system. Have you explored that?

Admiral PELTIER. In our original plan we had proposed buildings in this area which would have required new storm drainage and new sewers. To the extent we are losing any storm drains, I cannot answer that. Of course, keeping the heliport area is very much a concern because that is where some of our tide gates are located and we want to control those.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When the record comes down, if you find you want to add anything to the explanation, please do so.

Admiral PELTIER. Yes, sir.

(Information requested follows:)

All existing utilities, existing permanent structures and hard-surfaced areas are contemplated as being used to the maximum. The estimated cost of these items is $5,500,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What difficulties are you encountering at the present time with reference to the existing seawall and essential repairs there if you are to continue to use this area as proposed?

Admiral PELTIER. I will have to supply that for the record, Mr. Chairman. I have no immediate information on the problem of the seawall.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Supply that for the record.

(Information requested follows:)

At this stage of development of this area the seawall is not considered to present any major problem.

COST ESTIMATES

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have had a stationmaster planned at this location by architect-engineers. What were their proposals for the total cost of this station and how does that compare to the estimate now before the committee?

Admiral PELTIER. I have that proposal.

Item for item, Mr. Chairman, there has been a small reduction, as I recall, but as you can see from this map we had to change this considerably. Here is the present boundary line. Right now our present boundary line is about like this. We are giving this area up here [indicating].

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the total cost involved?

Admiral PELTIER. This first increment was $19 million, but it includes facilities not shown here.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you have an estimated cost factor for the station as presently planned?

Admiral PELTIER. The first increment is $13.3 million.

Captain GAGE. The answer to the first question you asked about the total cost is slightly over $37 million, Mr. Chairman. Now you want to know the cost of what we presently have planned?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is correct. If the present plans are acceptable to all agencies that have an interest, what is the total cost of the modified approach as against the original approach?

Admiral PELTIER. We have a figure of $25 million total, but I would like to check the figures for the second increment as now planned.

Captain GAGE. Approximately $25.5 million total.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Check that and supply it for the record.

(Information requested follows:)

First increment	$13, 320, 000
Second increment	12, 243, 000
	$25, 563, 000

STATUS OF PLANS

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the present status of the plans for this proposed construction?

Admiral PELTIER. We are negotiating now to select an A. & E. We want to get started by May so that we can get the plans and specifications ready so that when Anacostia shuts down we can immediately start. The Andrews, Anacostia, and the naval station are all tied in together, so we have to have our plans and specifications done early in the third quarter so that we can go out for bids as soon as the flight operation shuts down at Anacostia, which is about July 1961.

ACTIVITIES TO BE LOCATED AT NAVAL STATION

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would you please tell the committee the units which are proposed to be located at the naval station and where they are located at the present time?

Captain GAGE. There is a sizable list of those, sir. Do you want me to give them now or supply them for the record?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Make a list and submit it for the record. It will save time.

Captain GAGE. Yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

1. The following activities will be situated at the relocated naval station:

Activity	*Present location*
Naval station	Naval Station, Washington, D.C.
Navy training publications center	Do.
Naval aviation engineering service unit	Do.
Navy accounts disbursing office	Do.
Naval dental clinic annex	Do.
Navy patent counselor office	Do.
Naval school of music	Do.
Naval intelligence school	Do.
Branch exchange	Do.
General court-martial board	Do.
Personnel research field activity	Tempo X
Naval photographic center	Naval Air Station, Washington, D.C.
Heliport	Naval Air Station, Anacostia

2. In addition, the relocated naval station will be required to support 1,821 officers and enlisted men assigned to activities within the Navy Department and other departmental agencies, as well as 350 transient personnel. The total planned personnel involved is 5,642. This figure includes 710 officers, 4,178 enlisted and 754 civilians.

Mr. SIKES. May I ask a question at this point?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Of course.

Mr. SIKES. Are all the units proposed to be located at the naval station in the Washington area now?

Captain GAGE. Yes, sir, all of the activities which we plan to locate at Anacostia are in the Washington area now.

Mr. SIKES. Do you propose in that relocation to give up facilities that are now being used by those units?

Captain GAGE. Yes, sir; the facilities used at the present site of the naval station are on land which belongs to the Department of the Interior and must be returned. In addition, the Arlington Barracks are on property that belongs to the Bureau of Public Roads, which we expect to return when our permit expires in October 1962.

Admiral CHEW. Plus the fact that those facilities are substandard and are distinct fire hazards.

Captain GAGE. Certain of the facilities at the present site of the naval station have been requested by the Department of the Interior, a swimming pool and a recreation center, for example.

NEED FOR RELOCATING ARLINGTON BARRACKS

Mr. SHEPPARD. I note that you plan to move the personnel from Arlington Barracks (quarters K) to Anacostia. Just what do you have at this location at the present time?

Captain GAGE. At quarters K we have barracks, messing and limited supporting facilities for about 1,500 enlisted men and women. This is the only place we berth enlisted women right now.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the need for this relocation from Arlington to Anacostia? You must have some basic reason. What is it?

Captain GAGE. There are two reasons. First, we are on land that belongs to the Bureau of Public Roads with a lease which will expire in 1962; and, in the consolidation of our functions we will have all our people in one place and in adequate facilities.

Admiral CHEW. Plus the fact that the barracks that the enlisted Waves are now living in are more than substandard. I happen to know one of the young women who works in our office who has to stand fire watch at night just as a protection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SIKES. Will there be requirement for those facilities after you move?

Captain GAGE. No, Sir. They are of such nature that I cannot conceive of anyone wanting to use them after we vacate them, and they are in the way of the planned expansion of the Shirley Highway—Columbia Pike complex.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I believe one of the reasons stated by either you or someone else in the past has been that the Bureau of Public Roads plans to utilize a section of this property for the widening of Shirley Highway. What is the present status of the proposals for this widening?

Admiral CHEW. I do not know the status of the plan.

Captain GAGE. I have no late knowledge except that I understand it is their plan to widen the complex in that area. To my knowledge there are no firm plans for immediate expansion. We will have to verify this with the Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do that and furnish it for the record, please.

Captain GAGE. We will do that.

(The information follows:)

Mr. SHEPPARD. As a matter of fact, is it not true that the, shall we say, most popular scheme at the present time and the one which costs the less of the proposals to date would utilize none of the Arlington Barracks property and would permit the Navy to retain this site?

You may have to go to the Bureau of Public Roads to get an answer to this question. If you do, follow that course and submit the answer for the record.

Captain GAGE. Yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

STATUS OF ARLINGTON BARRACKS LAND AREA

The Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, advises, as of April 7, 1960, that:

Land on which the Arlington Barracks (quarters K) is located was acquired by the Bureau of Public Roads as part of the access land system of the Pentagon. Public Roads has requested funds for a traffic and engineering study in connection with a proposal to improve Columbia Pike and Shirley Highway. The proposal for improving this roads complex involves the utilization of land upon which the Arlington Barracks are located.

The previous proposal to turn the Arlington Barracks area over to the State of Virginia upon determination of the Navy's lease did not materialize as the State of Virginia did not accept the transfer "as is" since the cost of improvement to meet the State's requirements would have been excessive.

PROPOSED POPULATION OF STATION

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the present population of the units to be berthed at the naval station, and what population are you planning on as the basis for these construction estimates?

Captain GAGE. At the present time, sir, we are berthing about 2,800 enlisted. This varies frequently. Our plan is based upon a loading of 3,000 male enlisted, 500 female enlisted, and approximately 300 officers. The additional load results from planned increases in Army and Air Force music school students, personnel of photographic center now berthed at the air station, and personnel now receiving subsistence and quarters. Would you like a breakdown on that?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes. Put it in the record.

(The information follows:)

Planned personnel loading and berthing requirements of naval station, Washington, D.C., and tenant activities

Activity	Staff			Students at tenant activities			Staff of supported tenant activities			Totals	Berthing requirements		
	Officer	Enlisted	Civilian	Officer	Enlisted	Civilian	Officer	Enlisted	Civilian		Officer	Enlisted	Notes
Naval station	48	773	207							1,028	12	531	1
Navy Accounts Disbursing Office							2	3	40	45		2	1
Heliport							10	44		54	3	31	1
Crash boat								6	2	8		4	1
Naval photographic center							37	397	126	560	9	278	1
Patent counselor office									12	12			
Naval dental clinic annex							4	10		14	1	7	1
Navy training publications center							16	38	90	144	4	27	1
Naval aviation electronics service unit				15	15	10	16	22	31	109	8	30	1, 2
Naval school of music					670		12	128		810	3	760	1, 2
Naval Intelligence School				270	90		39	48	33	480	77	124	1, 2
Branch exchange									200	200			
General Court Martial Board							1	3	3	7		2	1
Miscellaneous Navy Department support							190	1,631		1,821	190	1,631	3, 4
Transients							50	300		350	50	300	5
Totals	48	773	207	285	775	10	377	2,630	537	5,642	357	3,727	

Note 1. Requirements for staff are based on 25 percent of officers and 70 percent of enlisted men.

Note 2. Requirements for students are based on 25 percent of officers and 100 percent of enlisted men.

Note 3. The 190 officers represent 4 percent of total remaining officers in the Washington area.

Note 4. The 1,631 enlisted men represent 38 percent of total remaining enlisted men in the Washington area.

Note 5. Requirements for transients are based on experience.

PERSONNEL BERTHED AT NAVAL WEAPONS PLANT

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have certain personnel berthed in the Naval Weapons Plant in Building 166. What do you propose to do with this building if the new station is constructed?

Captain HALL. Of course the Weapons Plant is kind of up in the air now. We have a use for the structure.

Admiral CHEW. The question was: Would the people presently barracked there remain there?

Captain HALL. Some of them would.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would make an analysis of that and insert the answer when the record comes down.

Admiral CHEW. Yes, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

SPACE ANALYSIS OF BUILDING 166, NAVAL WEAPONS PLANT, WASHINGTON, D.C.

There is a total of 89,346 square feet of space in Building 166 utilized as follows:

Berthing space of 42,016 square feet. To accommodate 224 [1] enlisted personnel. This space is used by the naval station for overflow berthing.

Office space of 47,330 square feet utilized as follows:

Armed services police detachment, 19,200 square feet; load, 178 military, 1 civilian.

District intelligence office, 10,910 square feet; load, 21 military; 33 civilians.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, 7,500 square feet; load, 28 military.

Dental clinic, 9,720 square feet; load, 53 military, 3 civilians.

The space released by the 171 military will be used to satisfy an urgent requirement for additional classroom space for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center. The poor structural condition of Building 166 may make rehabilitation uneconomical.

TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONNEL

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you know the number of personnel who require daily transportation from their present quarters to their place of work and can you compare this to those who would require daily transportation from the new consolidated station to their work?

Captain GAGE. That has been broken down in previous studies but I do not have it available at this moment. It was done by representatives of the Bureau of Yards and Docks.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Supply it for the record.

Captain GAGE. Yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

PLANNED DAILY TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONNEL FROM RELOCATED NAVAL STATION TO PLACE OF WORK

Washington: Naval Security Station, Naval Security Group, National Security Agency, etc., total, 375.

Virginia: BuFers, Service Center, etc., total, 184.

Naval Weapons Plant: PRNC, Diving School, Armed Forces Police, etc., total, 300.

New Navy Department Building: Various bureaus and offices, total, 142.

Southeast Maryland: N.R.L., Hydro Office, etc., total, 239.

[1] These 224 military will be relocated to the new naval station when built.

Relocated Naval Station	
Intelligence School	125
Music School	670
Photo Center	193
N.A.E.S.U	11
N.A.D.O	4
N.T.P.C	23
Heliport	22
Naval Station	575
Transients	300
Total	1,923

The only appreciable change in distance in present daily transportation over planned daily transportation is:

1. In the event the New Navy Department Building is located in Virginia, the distance to be traveled will be increased from 3 miles to approximately 10 miles for about 142 personnel.

2. The majority of the 1,500 personnel berthed at Arlington Barracks (quarters K) work in the Pentagon, a distance of 1 mile and at the Arlington Annex where no appreciable distance is involved. Berthing these people at the naval air station will increase the traveling distance by about 5 miles.

NEED FOR LOCATION OF SCHOOL OF MUSIC IN WASHINGTON

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why is it necessary that the School of Music be in Washington, D.C.? What consideration have you given to transferring this school to other locations?

Mr. KENYON. We have considered other places such as Bainbridge and Great Lakes, for example. However, it is an ideal location here in Washington, primarily because of its support of the Navy Band and also its being close to the Bureau of Naval Personnel where its administration takes place.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I was under the impression that on some occasions the Navy itself had attempted to transfer this operation to another geographical area but something stopped you. What stopped you?

Mr. KENYON. As I said, Mr. Chairman, we have given consideration to putting it in other places and there was a time when we thought rather strongly of putting it in Bainbridge. This was at a time when it was planned to build Bainbridge up, but as Bainbridge has waned somewhat that has been given up. Its location in Washington, where we provide training for Army bandsmen as well as the Navy, appears to be an ideal location, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There has been no other influencing characteristics involved?

Mr. KENYON. Sir, I am not sure I understand the question.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let us change the word "characteristics" to interruptions from other sources?

Mr. KENYON. I know of none, Mr. Chairman.

Admiral CHEW. I know of none.

Captain GAGE. Another factor on the pro side, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that we are a joint school, as Mr. Kenyon indicated, not only for the Army but also for the Air Force which we are not now handling in the numbers they desire because of a lack of capacity to do so. At our new site we plan to handle the Air Force requirements as well as the Army, Navy, and Marines.

NEED FOR LOCATION OF NAVAL AVIATION ENGINEERING SERVICE UNIT IN WASHINGTON

Mr. SHEPPARD. One of the other locations here is a Naval Aviation Engineering Service unit. Why cannot this be transferred to some other location? Has that been surveyed?

Captain GAGE. Mr. Chairman, that is a field activity of the Bureau of Weapons, formerly the Bureau of Aeronautics. Their function is closely related to the operations of the Bureau itself, and it has been the Bureau's strong position that this function must be nearby.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think you had better check up on this one, Admiral, because there are possibilities here that I think you will find when you check up on it, if you will, please.

Admiral CHEW. Yes.

NEED FOR NAVAL TRAINING PUBLICATIONS CENTER TO BE LOCATED IN WASHINGTON

Mr. SHEPPARD. Another installation is the Naval Training Publications Center. Why cannot this be transferred to some other area? Has that been surveyed?

Mr. KENYON. Yes, sir. Consideration has been given to putting that installation elsewhere. The major reason for its being in Washington is that the purpose of this Publications Center is to prepare technical publications. It requires consultation with the technical people in the technical bureaus in Washington in order to check the details.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where is the counterpart in the Army located, do you know?

Mr. KENYON. As a rule the Army has similar publications units in their area commands.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And there is nothing immediately adjacent to this facility geographically?

Mr. KENYON. No, sir.

NAVY ACCOUNTS DISBURSING OFFICE AND PATENT COUNSELOR'S OFFICE

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are also making provision for the Navy Accounts Disbursing Office and the Patent Counselor's Office. Why cannot these functions more logically be located in any new Navy headquarters building or at other locations in the Washington area?

Captain GAGE. Mr. Chairman, the Navy Accounts Disbursing Office handles the pay and allowances and accounts of all of the officer and enlisted personnel in the Washington area, and it is desirable that they be close to the customers who, for the most part, are the enlisted personnel who will be berthed and supported at the naval station.

To answer your question specifically, they could be put in the new Navy Department Building, but it is more efficient from the standpoint of their operation and from the standpoint of the customer to be there. Further, it will be necessary to relocate this activity before the new Navy building is expected to be completed. This same comment applies to the Patent Counselor's Office.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What prompted the question is the committee's knowledge of all the vacant buildings in the Naval Weapons Plant.

I was wondering why one of these could not be renovated for a brig, for example, without constructing a new one at the naval station? Has that been looked into?

Admiral CHEW. I think I can answer that, Mr. Chairman. Most of the buildings at the Weapons Plant would be of an industrial type and would not be generally suitable for this work.

Is that not right, Captain Gage?

Captain GAGE. Yes.

Mr. JONAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Mr. JONAS. Do you not have family quarters at the Weapons Plant?

Admiral CHEW. Yes. Other than those, the buildings generally are of the industrial type.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 6, 1960.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Gentlemen, we shall continue our hearings on the project we had under consideration when we recessed last evening. I ask you the following question:

CAPABILITY TO RETRENCH INTO REMAINING BUILDINGS

With reference to the present naval station, what is your capability to retrench into the remaining buildings here if the new Anacostia Freeway is constructed and to utilize that for personnel together with building 166 in the Weapons Plant and the Arlington Barracks?

Captain GAGE. Mr. Chairman, when the Anacostia Freeway is constructed, our total berthing capacity in the remaining facilities will be reduced to about 2,600. That includes building 166, the facilities at Arlington Barracks, and the barracks at the present naval station, a portion of which will be cut off by the right-of-way. We plan within the retrenchment to close in those barracks and continue to utilize the remaining space.

POSSIBLE USE OF FACILITIES AT WEAPONS PLANT

Mr. SHEPPARD. What consideration have you given to the use of the facilities at the Weapons Plant for at least a large portion of the activities you plan for the naval station?

Admiral CHEW. Actually, Mr. Chariman, the basic part of the Weapons Plant is industrial and is not suitable to development of this type of activity. There are, as you know, certain barracks in the Weapons Plant, and provided we maintain that, those barracks will be utilized.

Mr. SIKES. May I ask a question at this point?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Mr. SIKES. If the gun factory is closed and the operation is discontinued as such, is it proposed that the barracks and housing at the Weapons Plant will continue to be utilized?

Admiral CHEW. Mr. Sikes, I would have to go back to the Secretary's testimony on that. Plans as yet are not firm. As Mr. Milne stated, he could not foresee at this time the exact and precise use to which the Weapons Plant would be put.

Mr. SIKES. At the moment, the question is whether or not it is to be continued in its present activity and, if not, I assume from what has been said there are no plans to utilize it. Is that a reasonable assumption?

Admiral CHEW. No, I would not say that, sir. I think I would be safe in saying if it is to be used, we would have need for the facilities which are now being used in the administrative and berthing areas.

Mr. SIKES. How many people could be accommodated in the barracks and in the family housing which is available?

Admiral CHEW. Have you the capacity?

I will furnish the exact capacity of the barracks for the record, unless Captain Hall knows it.

Captain GAGE. Building 166.

Captain HALL. I can comment on barracks 166. There is quite a bit of office space there. The Armed Services Police, for one. That is 190 people. We have a district intelligence office which is in there. That is about 50. The dental clinic is about 50-odd. And the overflow from the naval station itself takes care of about 200 to 250 people actually berthed.

Mr. SIKES. Is there only one barracks building at the gun factory?

Captain HALL. Yes, sir. It is very old, and should be screened for demolition. It was built in 1913.

Mr. SIKES. So if any other buildings were made available for barracks space, it would require conversion?

Admiral CHEW. Yes, sir; conversion basically from an industrial facility to a barracks facility, sir.

Mr. SIKES. What is the situation on family housing?

Admiral CHEW. I will furnish the precise number of quarters for the record, sir.

Captain GAGE. Mr. Sikes, presently in building 166 we have berths for about 224 men as indicated by Captain Hall.

(The information requested follows:)

There are 30 sets of family public quarters at the Naval Weapons Plant. Ten are designated for occupancy by officers of flag rank, seven are occupied by captains, and the remaining units are occupied by officers below the rank of captain.

STATUS OF PROPOSED NEW HEADQUARTERS BUILDING

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Navy has had pending for some time a proposed new headquarters building. I realize that according to your justification for this building, you claim that only a portion of the personnel to be housed at the naval station would work at this new headquarters building. What is the current status of this proposal? What determination has been made in that respect?

Admiral CHEW. The current status of the new headquarters building, as I understand now, is up before GSA to determine a site, and that has not been finally decided upon, sir.

Your statement is correct, sir, that only a few of the personnel who would work at the new headquarters building would be berthed at the naval station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, that would have to do, as I understand it, with a new Federal office building described here as No. 11, to be constructed for the Department of Defense to be available for occupancy in about 5 or 6 years if the present plans are followed.

Admiral CHEW. Approximately 5 or 6 years, as I understand it, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But it is in an undetermined status at this time?

Admiral CHEW. Undetermined at this time; yes, sir.

Captain GAGE. Mr. Chairman, sir, our analysis of the personnel indicates that about 142 enlisted people will work in that building if and when it is built.

You asked yesterday for a breakdown of transportation. This is part of it. About 142 will be allied to that building.

TOTAL BERTHING CAPACITY UNDER RETRENCHMENT

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would list for the record at this point the berthing capacity of the Naval Station, Anacostia, upon the retrenchment which you have just testified to and justified previously to the committee, the berthing capability of Arlington Barracks and of the Naval Weapons Plant. Do that in the category as requested when the record comes down to you.

Captain GAGE. Yes, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

Upon retrenchment, with partially demolished barracks at Anacostia closed in and utilized, total enlisted berthing capacity will be as follows:

Naval Station, Anacostia	950
Arlington Barracks (quarters "K")	1,523
Building 166, Naval Weapons Plant	224
Total	2,697

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions upon the item, gentlemen?

Mr. SIKES. Yes.

EFFECT OF BUILDING PROJECT UPON NUMBER OF PERSONNEL

I would like to discuss this whole picture with you a little. Here is the sort of thing that disturbs the committee. Statements have been made that from the officer personnel standpoint, the Navy's current and future proposals for the area create a larger naval installation in the Anacostia location than that presently existing at either the NAS or the present naval station. Would you say that is true?

Admiral CHEW. I do not think that is essentially correct, sir, because this would be a consolidation of facilities which would provide the barracks space now being taken care of at the annex and at the naval station, pulling in all other activities. It would be a difficult question to answer categorically, sir.

Mr. SIKES. This, then, would be a consolidation in one location of naval activities which are presently distributed over the entire Washington area? Is that generally true?

Admiral CHEW. That is generally correct; yes, sir.

Captain GAGE. In response to your first question, Mr. Sikes, as far as people are concerned, the only major increase involved will be the increased number of students in the music school which, as I mentioned yesterday, will be mostly Air Force personnel.

Mr. SIKES. Would this bring into the Washington area any new activities or personnel not presently in the area?

Admiral CHEW. No.

Captain GAGE. With the exception of the Air Force students, none, to our knowledge.

TOTAL ESTIMATED COST

Mr. SIKES. Did I understand on yesterday that you said the total cost might run in the neighborhood of $37 million?

Admiral CHEW. That is correct sir.

Admiral PELTIER. That was the cost of the original plan. It has been reduced down to about $25 million.

Mr. SIKES. Does the $25 million include recreational and morale facilities? Will it complete the installation?

Admiral PELTIER. Have you a breakdown of those?

Captain GAGE. Yes, sir. The $25.5 million in our present plan includes all of the presently envisioned basic facilities required.

Mr. SIKES. With morale and recreational facilities?

Captain GAGE. We do not have all the recreation and morale facilities in the present plan, Mr Sikes. There will be some which will be developed at a later date.

Mr. SIKES. What do you anticipate they would cost?

Captain GAGE. I do not have that broken down right here, sir, but we can supply it.

Mr. SIKES. Does this include roads?

Captain GAGE. Not specifically, sir. This would include athletic fields and facilities as well as clubs and activities of that nature which are largely supported, as you know, sir, through nonappropriated funds.

Mr. SIKES. To what extent has the Navy attempted to determine which of these organizations can be located at other existing naval installations?

Admiral CHEW. I think the matter has been thoroughly studied, and it has been determined that this is the optimum and most desirable location for these activities. It has been looked into thoroughly, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Are there some of these activities which could not properly be carried on at other bases away from Washington?

Admiral CHEW. In answer to the question, Mr. Sikes, I think it is possible to move, generally speaking, nearly any activity of this nature. This, however, is the most desirable location for these activities.

PROBLEM OF CONCENTRATION OF ACTIVITIES IN WASHINGTON

Mr. SIKES. You are aware of the continuing concentration of activities at the National Capital. It would appear that there might be good reason to move some of these activities away, even if only to get away from some of the congestion in this target area. You have the Navy Accounts Disbursing Office, heliport, crash boat, Naval and Photographic Center, Counselor's Office, Naval Dental Annex, Naval Publications Center, Naval Aviation Engineering Service Unit, Naval School of Music, Naval Intelligence School, Branch Exchange, and General Court-Martial Board all earmarked for this station.

It seems to be a great deal of concentration that you would want to avoid.

Admiral CHEW. I can state generally to the entire group, and then specifically to each one, sir.

First of all, I would say that to scatter activities would be, generally speaking, in this area of consolidation which we attempt to do, a rather expensive procedure.

Mr. SIKES. Not if there are available facilities.

Admiral CHEW. But generally speaking, sir, facilities do not meet that particular requirement. I speak specifically now to some that

you mention. For example, the heliport which we discussed yesterday.

Mr. SIKES. I understand the situation in that. I do not think you have much control over that situation. If the President feels he needs those helicopters standing by, then I think you and the Congress want him to have them.

Admiral CHEW. Yes, sir. The Intelligence School, for example, is the center of the Naval intelligence system. To move that school would be very wasteful.

Mr. SIKES. Is this the school itself, or the intelligence activity?

Admiral CHEW. This is the school, sir.

Mr. SIKES. It would appear that the school would not have to be located near the center of the intelligence operation.

Admiral CHEW. It does not necessarily have to be located there, but as a matter of convenience for reference material, for checking the source of the information, it would be a more efficient operation, I believe, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Where are the Army and the Air Force Intelligence Schools, do you know?

Admiral CHEW. I do not know where they are.

Captain GAGE. The Army Language School, Mr. Sikes, is in Monterey, Calif. I am not familiar with their Intelligence School——

Mr. SIKES. The Army and the Air Force.

Captain GAGE. As far as I know, the Air Force does not have an independent centralized school. Is that correct, Mr. Kenyon?

Mr. KENYON. That is correct. Both the Army and Air Force have intelligence courses in Washington. Army intelligence instruction is conducted either in Washington or at Fort Holabird. The Air Force conducts a variety of intelligence courses at bases in other locations in addition to those in Washington.

Captain GAGE. The reason for our Intelligence School being in the Washington area is that our students and our school work closely with the Office of Naval Intelligence here in the Department of the Navy, closely with the CIA, and closely with other activities in the Washington area. It has been determined that this is the most logical and feasible site for the school.

Unlike the Army Language School in Monterey, our language training is directly related to the intelligence training that our naval attaches and other officers obtain before they go to duty in foreign countries. We utilize the services of the Army school for the more exotic language courses and for courses which we do not teach. Their training is normally of much longer duration than is ours in the language portion; the intelligence portion is the major factor here in Washington.

Mr. SIKES. How long is the course at your Intelligence School?

Mr. KENYON. About 9 months, Mr. Sikes. The language part, however, differs in length, depending upon the type of language which the man needs to learn. That may be as short as 6 weeks and as long as 14 months——

Mr. SIKES. Do you teach languages here?

Mr. KENYON. We do have languages as a part of the intelligence offering; yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Other than the increase which you spoke of in the School of Music, is it planned to increase any of your activities in this area?

Admiral CHEW. No, sir.

Captain GAGE. There are some very minor increases in some of the smaller activities, Mr. Sikes, but no substantial increase other than the students in the Music School.

Mr. SIKES. I think that is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The gentleman on my left.

Mr. JONAS. At the present naval station, the Navy was allotted 2.68 acres of the 63-acre tract and the rest was under lease from the Department of the Interior?

Captain GAGE. That is correct, sir. The Navy owns the smaller portion. The rest was leased from the Department of the Interior until 1946 and has since been occupied without permit.

BUILDINGS TO BE DEMOLISHED

Mr. JONAS. Are you planning to demolish all the buildings at the naval station, or will any be retained?

Captain GAGE. Not all will be demolished. The Department of the Interior, Mr. Jonas, has requested that certain of the facilities be left when we vacate the property and return it to them.

Mr. JONAS. Which will they be?

Captain GAGE. The main building involved is the large recreation building, which includes a swimming pool. They have asked that that be left. Most of the other facilities will be demolished.

Mr. JONAS. Will the Navy retain any buildings on its 2.68 acres?

Captain GAGE. No, sir. We will be out of there completely.

PROPERTY THAT WILL BE AFFECTED BY FREEWAY

Mr. JONAS. What will you do with your 3 acres?

Captain GAGE. That will be excess to our needs. We will have no requirement for it. This 2.68 acres of which you speak is part of the entire station complex. It is not a separated parcel, but a part of the entire complex that we own. When we relocate we will vacate the entire establishment.

Mr. JONAS. It has not been specifically allocated as to location? You just have 2.68 acres of the 63 acres, without designation?

Captain GAGE. Not for a specific purpose.

Mr. JONAS. I mean, do you know in which part of the 63-acre tract your 2.68 acres are located?

Captain GAGE. Yes, sir; we know what portion that is. It is definitely delineated. This land was obtained by condemnation in 1942 when the original station was constructed.

Mr. JONAS. What is on it? You just said a building and swimming pool.

Captain GAGE. That is not on it; no, sir.

Mr. JONAS. What is on the 2.68 acres which the Navy owns?

Captain GAGE. I will get that exactly. I cannot recall the specific buildings which are on it.

(Additional information follows:)

The following buildings are sited on the 2.68 acres: building 7, barracks; building 33, boilerhouse; building 70, office space.

Mr. JONAS. Will any part of that be taken for the freeway?

Captain GAGE. It is in the northwest corner and it will be involved in the roadway.

Mr. JONAS. The northwest?

Captain GAGE. The northeast corner.

Mr. JONAS. It is the southeast corner, is it not?

Captain GAGE. The roadway runs northeast to southwest on the eastern side, sir, and this 2.68 acres, which is midway along that side, will be involved in the area which will be lost by the right-of-way.

Mr. JONAS. Captain, you say it will be involved. What I want to know is whether the freeway will go across this 2.68 acres.

Captain GAGE. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. Are you sure of that?

Captain GAGE. That is correct.

Mr. TIENCKEN. Part of the freeway will go across part of the 2.68 acres.

Admiral CHEW. Can you delineate the 2.68? Let us show it.

Captain GAGE. The 2.68 acres of which we speak is right in this area [indicating]. This is the plan for the freeway. So it will be involved in the freeway construction.

Mr. JONAS. To such an extent as to make it unusable?

Captain GAGE. As to make it unusable; yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. The net result is that you are compelled to move everything out of the naval station?

Captain GAGE. No, sir. If we can consider the 2.68 acres, which we own, from the rest of the station, only those facilities in the total complex which are in the right-of-way of the freeway will have to be removed. There will be many facilities left on the remainder of the installation. Here is a better picture of that. From here over, Mr. Jonas, these are the buildings which will have to be demolished. All of these buildings over here will still be usable, but of course in the retrenchment we would have to provide a whole new utility system, power and heating, because they are in the demolition zone. These are the buildings which will have to come down.

The heating plant is one of the facilities which will have to be removed. That has been provided for, if retrenchment is necessary, within the money appropriated in fiscal year 1959.

QUESTION AS TO NEED FOR RETURN OF PROPERTY TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

Mr. JONAS. Do you contemplate abandoning these buildings completely as soon as you have a relocation site?

Captain GAGE. Yes, sir. When we return this property to the Department of the Interior it is our plan to restore it to the original condition—which means removal of all the buildings except those which have been specifically requested by the Department of the Interior, such as the recreation building I mentioned earlier.

Mr. JONAS. So it is not a matter of necessity to remove yourself from those buildings which will not be demolished unless you are required to do so by the Department of the Interior, is that correct?

Captain GAGE. That is correct; yes, sir. However, the Department of the Interior has repeatedly requested return of this property, sir.

Mr. JONAS. I understand, but it is a part of the same Government that you are.

Captain GAGE. If we were not forced to return it to the Department of the Interior, we could occupy the buildings. However, I would like to point out——

Mr. JONAS. It would eliminate the requirement for many of these new buildings you are requesting.

Captain GAGE. Temporarily only, Mr. Jonas, because most of the buildings at the present Naval Station, as Admiral Chew pointed out yesterday, are old, deteriorated wooden structures which would require replacement eventually if we were to continue at the present site.

Mr. JONAS. I understand that. I was thinking in terms of staying there several years instead of 10 or 15 or permanently.

Admiral CHEW. Let me speak to that, Mr. Jonas, if I may.

We have repeatedly turned down projects within our office for keeping these buildings up. They have reached the point of diminishing returns. They are substandard, as I have testified to before. If I may go off the record, sir, for a second.

(Off the record.)

CRITICISM OF BUILDING NEW CONCENTRATIONS OF FACILITIES IN WASHINGTON AREA

Mr. JONAS. Frankly, I concur in what has been said by my colleagues about their feeling with respect to continuing to build up new concentrations of facilities in this area. You gentlemen have testified that all possible locations have been considered and rejected but, frankly, we have to be convinced that there is no alternative before we start another program of $25 million for new buildings here in the Washington area.

We constantly hear of installations scattered around the country which are not fully utilized and where space is available. We have discussed Bainbridge with the admiral several times in this committee, which is a sore subject, I might add, because the Navy apparently changed its mind 2 or 3 times in a period of about a year or so on this installation. They started building that facility up, spending a lot of money, and induced the people in the local community to build schools and roads, and about the time their bonds were sold and these community support activities built, the Navy changed its mind again and said it had no future use for Bainbridge.

I, for one, do not like that kind of operation. I do not know whether there is anything at Bainbridge that is available for the activities you plan to put at this naval station, but there are others around the country.

We must be fully convinced there is no alternative except to embark on this program which will ultimately cost at least $25 million. Maybe we ought to make use of those facilities which will not be demolished at the naval station until this subject can be further explored.

Admiral CHEW. I think, Mr. Jonas, the primary function of this is consolidation and to achieve a certain efficiency and facility of control of people. We have to move and we have to provide housing for the people in the area.

UTILIZATION OF WEAPONS PLANT

Mr. JONAS. This other subject has come up several times during the hearings. My present feeling is that I will not be willing to spend this money until the Navy makes up its mind what it is going to do

about the weapons plant. I have been hearing that plant discussed for 4 years. It seems to me some decision should be made to close it down, phase it out, or use it. What do you say about that, Admiral?

Admiral CHEW. I think I would refer to the Secretary's testimony that that decision will be forthcoming, sir.

Mr. JONAS. Forthcoming when? I think it should have been forthcoming months ago. I am not blaming you. You do not make the decision, but somebody in the Department of the Navy needs to make his mind up on what they are going to do with that plant. We ought to find out what facilities are there which can be used in substitution for the proposed construction program here. I do not believe you are going to get much sympathy on this side of the table for embarking on this program until a decision is made as to what is to happen to the Weapons Plant.

Admiral CHEW. Before Mr. Reed, who is from the Assistant Secretary's office, speaks, I think I should clarify one point, sir. Basically the Weapons Plant is an industrial facility. I would say, if asked the hypothetical question and if I can keep it hypothetical, if the decision is made that those administrative and housing facilities are to be retained, I am sure they will be put to the best possible use.

Mr. JONAS. What use will that be? If you complete this construction program, will that not take care of your needs in the metropolitan area?

Admiral CHEW. As I pointed out, sir, in that particular area of the weapons plant there is only one substandard barracks building at the present time, the primary need for this station being to house our personnel.

Mr. JONAS. How many people have been quartered at the weapons factory, how many family units?

Admiral CHEW. As I said, sir, I would have to provide that figure for the record.

Mr. JONAS. How many enlisted men?

Captain GAGE. There are 224, as I mentioned to Mr. Sikes earlier, sir, in the one building.

Mr. JONAS. In barracks?

Captain GAGE. In the one barracks building.

Mr. JONAS. How many family quarters?

Captain GAGE. For enlisted? None, to my knowledge, for enlisted. The quarters at the gun factory, sir, are for officer personnel, none for enlisted.

Mr. JONAS. How many family units?

Admiral CHEW. I will provide that. There are somewhere in the neighborhood of 30 or 35.

(The information requested follows:)

There are 30 sets of family public quarters at the Naval Weapons Plant. Ten are designated for occupancy by officers of flag rank, seven are occupied by captains, and the remaining units are occupied by officers below the rank of captain.

Mr. JONAS. You have an administration or headquarters building and many other buildings there which are not industrial-type structures.

Captain GAGE. Yes, Mr. Jonas. Those facilities are currently occupied and will continue to be occupied by the commandant of the Potomac River command, his staff and other personnel, such as the district public works officer, who is also there. Initially it was

contemplated, if we vacated the entire Weapons Plant, to relocate those activities to this new site at the naval air station. That was part of the initial plan which Admiral Peltier referred to yesterday, costing $37 million. This is not now contemplated. Those activities will continue at the Weapons Plant, and they will continue to make use of all of the existing type of administrative space to which you refer.

Mr. JONAS. How could they remain there if the decision is to abandon the Weapons Plant and sell it?

Admiral CHEW. May we go off the record a while?

Mr. JONAS. We do not know what we should do here because we cannot until that decision is made and we know what happens to the Weapons Plant. If that is sold as surplus or disposed of, you will move those installations out.

(Off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Gentlemen, if it is agreeable to my colleagues here, of course, you have the right at any time to give us any information which is obtainable. Your position is undetermined at the moment. Maybe I am oversimplifying the situation, but I am trying to get some basis so we can at least say if somebody finally makes up his mind, this is what we will be confronted with.

Admiral PELTIER. That is an explosive issue.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It may be an explosive issue so far as many people are concerned, and we are fully sympathetic with you, but sometimes even with explosions and political characteristics, we still have to make up our minds about things.

Mr. JONAS. I would like to comment on that for the record, too. Whatever you decide will be unpopular, but that is the responsibility the man in authority must assume. We are not trying to tell you what to decide. We are just telling you that we are handicapped on this side of the table in authorizing funds for new construction in the metropolitan area until we know what that decision is to be. You clarified it considerably here in this off-the-record discussion, and I am glad to have that information, but I agree with the chairman that when you complete this record we would like you to go as far as you can in clarifying what the plans are down there. I hope maybe the decision can be made before we go to the floor with this bill.

Mr. SIKES. Will you yield at that point?

Mr. JONAS. Yes.

Mr. SIKES. You touched on a very important point. We have spent quite a bit of time on this project in this committee, and yet we are reasonably conversant with the Navy and its construction program. If we have found it difficult to understand all the connotations of this request, think how difficult it is for the average uninformed person to understand this big request for money when he sees in the paper that installations are being closed and that you do not know what you will do with other installations.

You had a statement, Mr. Reed?

Mr. REED. I wanted to say one thing, sir, and that is, the Secretaries are working very diligently on the decision on the Weapons Plant, believe me. I want to remind you, as Mr. Milne pointed out here, seven plants are involved. We are talking about the total capability for ordnance production. It is very difficult to isolate the one local issue when we are talking about: What does the Bureau need

and what does it have? The matching of requirements and assets. This is why it is taking time. They are pushing this thing fully.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let me say to the gentleman, this subject matter has been under discussion for at least 4 years, has it not?

Mr. REED. It is always being reviewed; yes, sir. As Mr. Milne mentioned to you, they did impanel this group of industrial experts, a so-called blue ribbon panel, who looked into this problem for us.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very frankly, my friend, with no offense to anybody, there have been times when you have been, shall we say, "overly panelized," too.

Mr. REED. A good point, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I say that with due respect to everybody involved. Again it goes back and creates in the minds of the members of the committee a very high degree of uncertainty. Gentlemen, if this thing has not been resolved, how good is this budget request right now?

Mr. REED. We distinguish the items, Mr. Chairman, as Admiral Chew pointed out.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What you are doing here is exactly what anybody else has to do. You have done the best you could under an undeterminable factor as of the moment in putting together this type of budget. Is that not true? When it comes right down to the final analysis right now, if you know this proposal is to be finalized and feel that you can say that, go right ahead and say it. I mean upon the premise that this budget appears before the committee right now.

Mr. REED. Again, as Captain Hall pointed out, we are talking about administrative personnel facilities verus industrial facilities.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Please, whether it is personnel or whether it is something else, this budget has been constructed for certain purposes. Am I right or wrong?

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The basic reasoning for your justifications presently before this committee is only assumptive within a reasonable degree, because it has not been finalized yet. The decision has not been made on that issue to the degree that you can say everything we present here will be done. Under the present basis of consideration, I think you are doing as well as you can. I think the budget was based upon that; but you are still dealing with a hypothetical situation as far as this money is concerned, until those determinations are actually firmed up. Is that right or wrong?

Mr. REED. I do not think the Anacostia facility is involved at all, sir, it meets a requirement distinguished from the Weapons Plant.

Mr. JONAS. I have one other question, Mr. Chairman.

ITEMS PLANNED FOR FUTURE CONSTRUCTION

This request we are considering today is for nine items to cost $13,320,000.

Admiral CHEW. That is correct, sir.

Mr. JONAS. You have plans which will involve at lest $24,576,000. Can you tell us now what are the remaining items involved in your future construction program?

Admiral CHEW. Yes, sir.

Would you enumerate the remaining items?

Captain GAGE. I have a complete listing. Would you like me to read them?

Mr. JONAS. Place it in the record at this point.

Mr. SHEPPARD. See that that information is placed in the record.

Mr. SIKES. If the gentleman will yield, I think the committee has also asked for a listing of the possible facilities, such as morale, recreation facilities, access roads, which are not included in the second increment.

Mr. JONAS. That was my next question. Would you just read them off?

(Off the record.)

(The information requested follows:)

In addition to the items contained in the fiscal year 1961 military construction appropriation bill, the following items are planned for future construction. This list includes morale and recreation facilities which are estimated to cost $2.5 million.

Rehabilitation of building 72 for Music School
Naval Intelligence School
Naval Aviation Engineering Service Unit
Addition to building 92 for Naval Training Publications Center
Addition to building 94 for storehouse
Married officers' quarters
Barracks (men), second increment
Barracks (women)
Fire station
Gatehouse
Extension of utilities
Roads, walks, parking, and siting
Demolition
Public works shops (building 90)
Flammable storehouse
Navy Exchange warehouse
Crashboat facility
Bachelor officers' quarters with mess
Enlisted men's club
Outdoor athletic facilities
Recreation building
Gymnasium
Chapel
Chief petty officers club

Mr. JONAS. With reference to the question asked by Mr. Sikes, you have not mentioned anything involving morale or recreation, and that sort of thing.

Captain GAGE. Some of the morale and welfare facilities are included, but not all, as I mentioned to Mr. Sikes, sir. Those will come up at some subsequent date if sufficient land is available.

Mr. JONAS. It would be reasonable for us to assume that you will be asking for some of those?

Captain GAGE. Yes, sir. They will not be very extensive, however.

Mr. JONAS. That is all.

(Off the record.)

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next category of facilities is communication facilities.

Please place in the record at this point the summary sheet and the justification statement with respect thereto.

(The matter referred to follows:)

Communication facilities

Installation and line item	Proposed funding	Fiscal year authorization
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES		
Naval Radio Station, Adak, Clam Lagoon, Alaska: Radio receiver facility	$670,000	1961
Naval Radio Station, Annapolis, Md.:		
Antennas	645,000	1961
Electric switching station	150,000	1961
Total	795,000	
Naval Radio Station (R), Cheltenham, Md.: Antennas	396,000	1961
Naval Radio Station (T), Dixon, Calif.: Fleet broadcast facility	2,474,000	1961
Naval Radio Station (R), Skaggs Island, Calif.: Radio direction finder facility	1,579,000	1961
Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove, W. Va.: Large steerable antenna (3d increment).	17,800,000	[1] 1961
Naval Radio Station, Wahiawa, Oahu, Hawaii: Antennas	357,000	1961
Naval Radio Station (T), Washington County, Maine: VLF antenna facilities (2d increment).	7,300,000	[1] 1961
Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine: Radio direction finder facility.	2,279,000	1961
Subtotal, communication facilities, inside the United States	33,650,000	
OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES		
Naval Radio Station (T), Barrigada, Guam, Mariana Islands: Antennas	68,000	1961
Naval Radio Station (R), Finegayen, Guam, Mariana Islands: Radio receiver facility.	469,000	1961
Naval Security Group Activity, Galeta Island, Canal Zone: Radio direction finder facility	1,750,000	1961
Naval Security Group Activity, Karamursel, Turkey: Receiver building	84,000	1961
Naval Radio Station, Martin Pena, Puerto Rico: Antennas	72,000	1961
Naval Radio Facility (R), San Miguel, Luzon, Republic of the Philippines:		
Expansion of terminal building	142,000	1961
Expansion of electric power supply	241,000	1961
Total	383,000	
Naval Communication Unit, location classified (ES–1):		
Communication center facility	* 975,000	1961
Radio receiver facility	*1,325,000	1961
Radio transmitter facility	*3,142,000	1961
Microwave facility	* 67,000	1961
Warehouse	* 128,000	1961
Barracks	* 190,000	1961
Total	5,827,000	
Naval Security Group Activity, location classified (SC–1):		
Radio receiver facility	*3,235,000	1961
Rehabilitation of existing buildings	* 430,000	1961
Total	3,665,000	
Subtotal, communication facilities, outside the United States:		
Unclassified items	2,826,000	
Classified items	*9,492,000	
Subtotal, outside United States	12,318,000	
Total, communication facilities	45,968,000	

[1] Amendment.

Conduct of modern naval operations increasingly embodies command and management techniques dependent upon evaluation of thousands of items of operational and administrative information. This development has created an unprecedented demand for increased capacity, greater speed, enhanced reliability, and maximum efficiency of naval communications. Because modern weapons have reduced global distances to matters of minutes and seconds, high speed communications are vital to insure that operational contacts are immediately reported to command and control centers, and to permit orders to be flashed instantly to operating forces anywhere in the world. To achieve this reliability and speed, communications coverage must be improved, and extended to areas not hitherto utilized for protracted naval operations. Disruptions of radio communications also must be reduced.

The $20,868,000 of new construction items requested in this portion of the Navy's fiscal 1961 military construction program are essential to achieving efficient communications which have become indispensable to naval operations.

The major item requested in this program is a new communication facility to be established at a classified location overseas. This facility will provide additional communications capability urgently needed to reduce heavy overloads on present fleet circuits by providing alternate routes for high priority message traffic.

Improved area coverage and operating reliability of primary communications available to the Chief of Naval Operations will be accomplished by modernizing the antenna field and power switching station at the Naval Radio Station, Annapolis, and installing additional antennas at the Cheltenham, Md., naval radio receiving station.

Fleet broadcast coverage and command communications in the San Francisco area will be extended by the proposed fleet broadcast facility for Dixon, Calif. Additional antennas are required at Martin Pena, Puerto Rico, to improve fleet operational communications in the Caribbean Sea. Communications with the 7th Fleet will be improved by the proposed antenna line item for Barrigada, Guam.

Construction of additional facilities in Alaska, Hawaii, and Guam will provide much needed improvements capabilities for communications with fleet units operating in the Pacific area.

Operational reliability of the naval radio receiver facilities at San Miguel, Philippine Republic, will be substantially improved by the proposed projects for expansion of the terminal building and power supply.

Antisubmarine warfare capabilities will be significantly improved by the introduction of new equipment at certain key locations.

In addition to the foregoing requirements, amended obligational authority is requested in the amounts of $7,300,000 for the strategic VLF transmitting station at Cutler, Maine, and $17,800,000 for the giant radio telescope at Sugar Grove, W. Va. These amendments are necessary to complete authorized construction already in progress.

Admiral CHEW. This group of projects includes 17 unclassified line items at 15 stations for $36,476,000. Of these line items 10, for $33,650,000, are at 9 stations in the United States. The remaining 7 line items for $2,826,000 are at 6 oversea stations. There are also 2 oversea stations, with 8 line items for $9,492,000, at classified locations which will be discussed in executive session. All of the line items are in this year's authorization bill.

The purpose of these activities is to provide reliable, secure, and rapid communication for control of the operating forces; to perform security functions; and to facilitate administration of the Naval Establishment.

NAVAL RADIO STATION, ADAK, ALASKA

Mr. SHEPPARD. The first item is the hand Radio Station at Adak, Alaska.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL RADIO STATION (RECEIVING)	CLAM LAGOON, ADAK, ALASKA	2476-020

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
ANCHORAGE - 1,389 AIR MILES, NORTHEAST	ADAK ISLAND	CNO-DIRECTOR, NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS	17TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
COMMUNICATIONS ASHORE AND AFLOAT	1943	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

As an activity of the Naval Communication System, to manage, operate and maintain those facilities, equipments, devices and systems, necessary to provide communications for the Naval Establishment ashore and afloat and such other communications as may be directed by the Chief of Naval Operations.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	18	462	0	0	0	480
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	18	395	0	0	0	413
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	18	423	0	0	0	441

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT -	PLANNED -	ULTIMATE -

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS (3)
1. OWNED	3,242	0	16,362,000	16,362,000
2. LEASED	-	(-)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959			(Except Land Rent)	16,362,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				1,535,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				670,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				4,604,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				23,171,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY				AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
131	RADIO RECEIVER FACILITY	SF	14,400	2,020	0	2,020	670	0	670	670

75

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Carey & Kramer, Seattle, Wash., at a fee of $26,885.00, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and selection of an A. & E. firm is expected at an early date.

Admiral CHEW. The first project is at the Naval Radio Station, Clam Lagoon, Adak, Alaska, for new radio receiver facilities at the estimated cost of $670,000. It is for construction of an extension to the existing receiver building and new antennas to provide space and the means for operation of special radio equipment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the status of the equipment which will go into this facility?

Admiral VIRDEN. The status of the equipment to go into the radio receiving facility at Adak, Alaska. The equipment for this particular station is similar to the equipment for all of these facilities which are programed, and they are being phased in the procurement program to be there in time for the completion of the military construction. These are receiving stations, and they will have receiving equipment which is programed to arrive in time to be installed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, the equipment is coordinated to be available at the time the construction is completed?

Admiral VIRDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Admiral Peltier, what is the liaison between the construction division of the Navy, in this instance, and the manufacturers of the mechanical devices? What line of operation ties itself together here so this project actually comes out at the end of the pipeline coordinated?

Admiral PELTIER. As you probably know, Mr. Chairman, we have had projects where we have had the facilities portion completed and then some delay in the equipment installation. However, the liaison has been improved tremendously, in my opinion, in the last year. On several of these projects, this one not as much as others because the equipment is more or less standard black boxes, we have had to have our architect-engineer coordinate his work with the people designing and laying out the electronic equipment. In fact, in some cases we have combined the A. & E. We have had A. & E.'s who would do both. In other words, it was a joint venture.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would it be his responsibility to make the investigation and make his findings available to you or your deputy or whoever else would be in charge of your Department?

Admiral PELTIER. The Industrial Manager of the Navy, in this particular case out of Seattle, would be the responsible agent to install this equipment. The liaison between our District Public Works and the Industrial Manager will be maintained and is being maintained in the development of plans in the construction and the installation of equipment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You made a statement a moment ago that was very interesting, and that is the fact that the liaison had improved. How much more improvement can we get in that liaison as compared to what it previously had been?

Admiral PELTIER. The area which needs more improvement is in the research area, but in the communications area I think this thing has been pretty well worked out.

In the area of telemetering, and things such as that, not quite as standard as our communications, it is difficult and we are still working on that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using to meet this communications need at the present time?

Admiral VIRDEN. This particular item is a new installation, Mr. Chairman. We do not have this capability at the present time, Mr. Chairman.

NAVAL RADIO STATION, ANNAPOLIS, MD.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next is the Naval Radio Station at Annapolis.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL RADIO STATION (TRANSMITTING)	ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND	5293 055
4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. Over 10,000) Distance & Direction	**5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY**	**6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE** / **7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA**
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 2 MILES WEST	ANNE ARUNDEL	CNO - DIRECTOR, NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS / SEVERN RIVER NAVAL COMMAND
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
COMMUNICATIONS ASHORE AND AFLOAT	1918	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

As an activity of the Naval Communication System, to manage, operate and maintain those facilities, equipments, devices and systems necessary to provide requisite communications for the Naval Establishment ashore and afloat and such other communications as may be directed by the Chief of Naval Operations.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	3	79	25	0	0	107
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	5	90	28	0	0	123
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1961	5	90	28	0	0	123

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT -	PLANNED -	ULTIMATE -

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	527	163,000	4,252,000	4,415,000
2. LEASED	-	(-)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Cost)		4,415,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				795,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				0
7. GRAND TOTAL				5,210,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE (1)	LINE ITEM TITLE (2)	UNIT (3)	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 (4)	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED (5)	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 (6)	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED (7)	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES (8)	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 (9)	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED (10)	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED (11)
132	ANTENNAS	EA	130 (64 SUBSTANDARD)	22	0	22	645	0	645	645
812	ELECTRIC SWITCHING STATION	KVA	1,500 (1,500 SUBSTANDARD)	1,500	0	1,500	150	0	150	150
								TOTAL	795	795

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
NAVDOCKS 2570 (7-58) Supersedes NavDocks 4080

BOOK NO. II PAGE NO. 64

(See notes on following page.)

559

ANTENNAS

The preliminary engineering report for this item is being prepared by Arcady A. Semenoff, Washington, D.C., at a fee of $35,070, and will be completed by April 15.

ELECTRIC SWITCHING STATION

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Arcady A. Semenoff, Washington, D.C., at a fee of $3,142, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and selection of an A. & E. firm is expected at an early date.

Admiral CHEW. The second project, consisting of two line items for a total of $795,000, is at the Naval Radio Station, Annapolis, Md. This is the transmitter station for the Naval Communication Station, Washington, D.C., which is the principal communcation facility serving the Chief of Naval Operations and the Navy Department and other naval activities in the area.

The first line item is for construction of antennas at the estimated cost of $645,000. It will provide an improved transmitting system of point-to-point antennas oriented on Pearl Harbor, Londonderry, and Port-Lyautey; wideband high-gain antennas for shore-to-ship use; and rehabilitation of existing arrays for improved fleet broadcast. Modern fleet operations require high speed, high volume, reliable, and secure communication between ships and shore-based commands. The proposed facilities are essential to satisfy this requirement.

The second line item is for an electric switching station at the estimated cost of $150,000. It will provide for construction of a metal-clad cubicle, mounted on a concrete pad; and installation of remotely controlled, electrically operated, metal-clad switchgear and ancillary control panel to replace obsolete switching equipment. From time to time, power failure occurs on either of the two commercial feeders or on a standby feeder from the nearby Naval Academy. Most often this is during inclement weather and electrical storms. At such times a maintenance man must enter the fenced enclosure to reach the existing 13,000 volt, manually operated, outdoor primary power switching station. He is then exposed to highly dangerous electrical hazards and high voltage shock. The proposed modern switching station will eliminate this hazard and reduce the circuit outage time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this communication request and all others in this program been cleared by the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

Admiral VIRDEN. The clearance procedure corresponds to a Department of Defense directive, Mr. Chairman, and all of those requirements have been met.

Mr. SHEPPARD. To what extent will this facility, or any other facility, be affected by any joint communication network, such as that presently under study?

Admiral VIRDEN. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I have a statement which I just prepared on this question. I believe it will clarify it.

By way of background, the joint communication network concept was approved by SECDEF on July 25, 1959. All of our thinking is now directed along channels which will turn this concept into a viable joint system. The exact composition and location of the

network management agency or mechanism remain to be decided by SECDEF. The services have agreed on a management mechanism under the JCS and are hopeful for its adoption.

The joint communication network concept provides for the operation of the network by the military department on a single system basis and for overall supervision of the network by the JCS.

It is important to note that the communications which are a part of the joint communication network and which are not, are carefully defined in this concept. The joint communication network is to consist of all point-to-point services from the JCS to and between the commanders of the unified and specified commands, and the point-to-point services from the commanders of these commands to and between their component and other subordinate commanders. Finally the joint communication network will include the point-to-point services from the military departments to and from their major commanders and the fixed headquarters of their subordinate echelons.

Now land, ship, or airborne terminal facilities of broadcasts systems, ship-to-shore, ship-to-ship, and ground-air-ground systems are not part of the network. A characteristic of these communications is that at least one of the terminals of any of these systems is mobile.

This applies to the Navy and a similar statement could be made with regard to the tactical units of the Army and Air Force.

The fiscal year 1961 class 9 MCON program consists of line items designed to rehabilitate and improve existing facilities of the naval communication system and the naval security group, plus line items for two new facilities at classified locations overseas. Inasmuch as joint communication network considerations relate to fixed point-to-point circuits, only those line items in the program which have point-to-point connotations are pertinent. The following line items do have such connotations:

Annapolis antennas (in part).
Cheltenham antennas (in part).
Wahiawa antennas (in part).
Location classified (ES–1) (in part) (which has a "re-termination" of existing circuits, functionwise).

All of these point-to-point circuits will be FEEDER circuits to support the fleet broadcast and ship-to-shore circuits.

The JCN concept provides for the evolutionary conversion of the military department systems into a joint network. This means that we are starting from what we have now and going on from there. We are not discarding or scrapping what is fully operational but rather we seek to improve it as contributing to the JCN. In this "evolutionary conversion" our implementing actions come under three categories:

Immediate—those actions which can be carried out in less than 6 months. These normally involve minor equipment installations and network arrangements.

Midterm—those actions which can be implemented in about 3 years. These plans will normally involve changes to or modernization of existing installations with little or no development of new equipment involved. It is here in the midterm implementation phasing of the JCN that we find our Navy line items which are in support of this

network. Antenna improvement, and retermination of point-to-point circuits fall in this category.

Finally, there is long-term phasing covering a period of 3–10 years involving major changes requiring research and development. There is no line item in this category.

NAVAL RADIO STATION, CHELTENHAM, MD.

The next project that we shall pick is the Naval Radio Station at Cheltenham, Md.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL RADIO STATION (RECEIVING)	CHELTENHAM, MARYLAND	5293 209

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
WASHINGTON, D. C. 14 MILES NORTHWEST	PRINCE GEORGES	CNO - DIRECTOR, NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS	POTOMAC RIVER NAVAL COMMAND

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
COMMUNICATIONS ASHORE AND AFLOAT	1935	[ ] MAINTENANCE [X] ACTIVE [ ] INACTIVE [ ] NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

As an activity of the Naval Communication System, to manage, operate and maintain those facilities, equipments, devices and systems, necessary to provide requisite communications for the Naval Establishment ashore and afloat and such other communications as may be directed by the Chief of Naval Operations.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	31	473	45	0	0	549
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	80	683	120	0	0	883
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1962	80	683	120	0	0	883

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	PLANNED	ULTIMATE
	-	-	-

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	563	78,000	3,179,000	3,257,000
2. LEASED	-	(-)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		3,257,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				2,489,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				396,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				2,258,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				8,400,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
132	ANTENNAS	EA	65	8	0	8	396	0	396	396

563

77

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DD FORM 2570 (7-58) Supersedes DD FORM 1390

BOOK NO. II PAGE NO. 65

(See note on following page.)

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by area public works officer, Chesapeake, and is presently being reviewed prior to authorization of final plans and specifications.

Admiral CHEW. The next project is at the Naval Radio Station, Cheltenham, Md., for construction of antennas at the estimated cost of $396,000. As the Annapolis Station provides the transmitting facilities, this activity provides the receiver facilities for the Naval Communication Station, Washington, D.C. This project will provide for three high-gain directional receiving antennas and four ship-to-shore sector sleeve antennas necessary for improved communication in modern fleet operations. High-speed, high-volume, reliable, and secure communication between ships at sea in the Atlantic Ocean area and the Mediterranean Sea and shore-based commands are a prerequisite to the success of naval operations in this strategic area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I presume this is predicated on the same premise as other items we have reviewed in this category?

Admiral VIRDEN. That is correct.

NAVAL RADIO STATION, DIXON, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then we have the Naval Radio Station at Dixon, Calif.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL RADIO STATION (TRANSMITTING)	DIXON, CALIFORNIA	5293 298

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
SACRAMENTO - 50 MILES NORTHWEST	SOLANO	CNO - DIRECTOR, NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS	12TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
COMMUNICATIONS - ASHORE AND AFLOAT	1940	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

As an activity of the Naval Communication System, to manage, operate and maintain those facilities, equipments, devices, and systems, necessary to provide communications for the Naval Establishment ashore and afloat and such other communications as may be directed by the Chief of Naval Operations.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	1	13	3	0	0	17
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	3	35	12	0	0	50
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1965	3	56	12	0	0	71

NO. OF AIRCRAFT — PRESENT - — PLANNED - — ULTIMATE -

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	1,284	84,000	1,357,000	1,441,000
2. LEASED	-	(-)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959 (Except Land Rent)				1,441,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				2,474,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				550,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				4,465,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
131	FLEET BROADCAST FACILITY	SF	16,314	18,800	0	18,800	2,474	0	2,474	2,474

170

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA

DAYDOCKS 2570 (7-58) Federated Business Forms

BOOK NO. II PAGE NO. 66

(See note on following page.)

565

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Porter, Urquhart, McCreary & O'Brien, San Francisco, Calif., at a fee of $32,000, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and selection of an A. & E. firm is expected at an early date.

Admiral CHEW. The fourth project is at the Naval Radio Station, Dixon, Calif., for construction of fleet broadcast facilities at the estimated cost of $2,474,000. The Dixon station is one of two transmitter components of the San Francisco Naval Communication Station. The proposed facilities include an addition to the existing transmitter building; two 650-foot-high vertical antennas and associated transmission lines and ground system; and standby generator plant and necessary utilities. The project will meet immediate operational communication requirements for fleet broadcast and ground-to-air communication for antisubmarine warfare and control of the fleet. The new facilities will include transmitters to be remotely controlled by the Western Sea Frontier Command and the naval air station at Alameda. The low-frequency component of the fleet broadcast will be installed at Dixon to replace the five 450-foot-high towers at Mare Island which must be removed because of their hazard to navigation, life, and property. If the proposed facilities are not constructed, adequate operational communication cannot be maintained with ships and aircraft operating off the west coast in support of ASW, search and rescue, and continental defense.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How are you meeting this need at the present time?

Admiral VIRDEN. This need at the present time is being met by the facility at Mare Island. These are radio towers in a bad state of repair, so this is essentially a replacement at Dixon which is real estate we already own of towers which will have to be torn down in the Mare Island area.

The Mare Island area is not a suitable place to reestablish these towers. It is a crowded industrial area. We can create a much better facility here at Dixon. No land acquisition is involved.

NAVAL RADIO STATION, SKAGGS ISLAND, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we pick up the naval radio station at Skaggs Island, Calif.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL RADIO STATION (RECEIVING)	SKAGGS ISLAND, CALIFORNIA	5293878

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
VALLEJO, 13 MILES, SOUTHWEST	SONOMA	CNO - DIRECTOR NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS	12TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
COMMUNICATIONS AND SECURITY GROUP FUNCTIONS	1942	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

As an activity of the Naval Communication System, to manage, operate and maintain those facilities, equipments, devices, and systems, necessary to provide communications for the Naval Establishment ashore and afloat and such other communications and Naval Security Group Functions as may be directed by the Chief of Naval Operations.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	17	260	50	0	0	327
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	17	230	50	0	0	297
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1962	17	260	50	0	0	327

NO. OF AIRCRAFT — PRESENT - PLANNED - ULTIMATE -

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	3,303	207,000	4,157,000	4,364,000
2. LEASED	1,000	(-)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		4,364,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				1,579,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				3,649,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				9,592,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11
131	RADIO DIRECTION FINDER FACILITY	SF	0	11,924	0	11,924	1,579	0	1,579	1,579

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA

DD FORM 2570 (7-58) Supersedes DD FORM 1390

BOOK NO. II PAGE NO. 67

(See note on following page.)

367

84

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Indenco Engineers, Inc., San Leandro, Calif., at a fee of $18,330, and is presently being reviewed prior to authorization of final plans and specifications.

Admiral CHEW. The fifth project is at the Naval Radio Station, Skaggs Island, Calif., for construction of a radio direction finder facility at the estimated cost of $1,579,000. The station is the receiver activity for the naval communication station at San Francisco.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How are you meeting this need at the present time?

Admiral VIRDEN. At the present time we have a small radio direction finder facility at Skaggs Island which is one of those which is being replaced in our overall replacement program of the older radio direction finders.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is the equipment necessary for this facility presently available?

Admiral VIRDEN. This equipment will be available in phase with the availability of this antenna.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, this is in the same status as others previously inquired of?

Admiral VIRDEN. That is right.

NAVAL RADIO RESEARCH STATION, SUGAR GROVE, W. VA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we come to the Naval Research Station at Sugar Grove, W. Va.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL RADIO RESEARCH STATION	SUGAR GROVE, WEST VIRGINIA	-

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
HARRISONBURG, VIRGINIA - 38 MILES EAST	PENDLETOWN COUNTY, WEST VIRGINIA	OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH	5TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
RADIO AND RESEARCH FUNCTIONS	NEW INSTALLATION	☐ MAINTENANCE ☐ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☒ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To perform communication functions as directed by the Chief of Naval Operations, and to perform research functions as directed by the Chief of Naval Research.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	MIL DEPNTS CIV	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	-	-	-	-	-	-
2. PLANNED - END FY 1962	31	352	185	-	12 - 24	604
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1968	44	848	185	-	18 - 51	1,146

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT -	PLANNED -	ULTIMATE -

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	1,756	188,000	-	-
2. LEASED	243	(-)	-	-
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959	(Exclude Land Rent)			0
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				71,857,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST	AMENDMENT ONLY			17,800,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				210,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				89,867,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
390	LARGE STEERABLE ANTENNA (AMENDMENT)	NA	-	-	-	-	77,800	60,000	17,800	17,800

52

(See note on following page.)

569

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Grad-Urbahn-Seelye and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by Grad-Urbahn-Seelye.

Admiral CHEW. The sixth project is for funding an amendment, in the amount of $17,800,000, to the authorization of $60 million granted in the fiscal year 1959 program by Public Law 85–685 for construction of the large steerable antenna at the Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove, W. Va. This facility will provide a valuable tool for communication and for study of the universe. The steerable main antenna, the chief feature of the facility, is a developmental structure without precedent for size, weight, complexity, and precision. Former estimates were prepared in early stages of design and are now inadequate to cover the complexities more fully realized as designs developed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice the cost at this facility has increased from $72 million as of last year to almost $90 million this year. What is the reason for this?

Admiral VIRDEN. This is another amendment.

Admiral PELTIER. Mr. Chairman, this facility is a research instrument. It is the largest movable structure perhaps in the world. The original estimates were made on the basis of a projection of what a smaller unit did cost as against what this size of unit would cost. In this case this projection has not proven to be valid.

We have six general areas of increased costs. The structural steel, for example, which originally was estimated at less tonnage than now is contemplated.

The price per ton that we have is about what we estimated, but the number of tons required, because of a structure of this size and as we developed the final plans and specifications, has increased. We have had an increase in requirement for structural steel.

Mr. SHEPPARD. As I understand your answer, Admiral Peltier, your problem has not been because of an increased price per ton of steel but it is because of the greater tonnage required.

Admiral PELTIER. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If the price of steel has gone up I want to know how much it is.

Admiral PELTIER. We took our bid before the steel strike. While there probably was, some anticipation as to the steel strike on the part of American Bridge, the low bidder, it is difficult to determine how much.

The price for the steel per ton was close to what the architect-engineer and we estimated.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In a contract of that nature, is the tonnage ordered for completion of the job or is it ordered on an incremental basis?

Admiral PELTIER. The main structure was ordered as one unit, but there will be a change order at the end to pay on the actual calculated quantity. We give a fairly good estimate of what we think the quantities will be. Then at the end we recalculate what it actually is.

We are just now starting to determine the final size of some of these members. We have had a 704 IBM machine working on the design of this for 6 or 7 months. You can imagine how many calculations you can make in that period of time.

It has been a tremendous design problem. It is almost beyond comprehension.

There are as many as 13 members coming together at one point and as many as 92 formulas must be worked out simultaneously. This taxes the capability of even the biggest commercial electronic data processing machines we have available.

It has really been a tremendous problem.

Just in the last 2 weeks have we reached the point where we can go ahead and size the last part of the structural design.

We have been fabricating the lower part, the main frame, but the upper part has been completed in just the last 2 weeks. We are now determining the actual structural sizes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you think the funds presently requested will complete the funding of this facility?

Admiral PELTIER. No, Mr. Chairman. We will have to come back for more.

We have taken bids on some of the items, such as drives, and aluminum panels, and we have received a bid in the last week or 10 days on other items and we are studying those now.

We will have to make an analysis to see if our requirements for this have to be as rigid as those in the specifications. We are trying to find out why this cost increase from the contractors, why they put on contingencies.

These have been performance specifications and it is really a development item on a firm price contract basis, and the contractor has to apply contingencies.

We are trying to determine what those contingencies are so we can negotiate them out or get them finalized.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would you say that the status of your plans at the present time are in a position to be finalized?

Admiral PELTIER. Yes, Mr. Chairman. We are still working on a few of the items that will be installed later and which are not yet complete, such as instrumentation, but in general the structural part, the brick and mortar portions, are complete. The development items still are incomplete.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How do you propose to handle the contract on the fiscal year 1961 program?

Admiral PELTIER. All this work which is in here, Mr. Chairman, is out on a competitive bid, a limited bidder's list, a subcontract from the prime contractor.

A little of this work will be done direct, perhaps, but it will be small, perhaps to tie in two portions of the work.

Mainly, this is so highly specialized that we have to qualify the bidder before we let him bid, we have to make sure he is capable of doing the job, and we try to get at least three bidders so we can get competitive bids.

Mr. SHEPPARD. So far you have been able to do that?

Admiral PELTIER. Yes, sir. I think the minimum number of bids has been four on the drives, which was a very complicated item. They started out with about 12 but people dropped out as they got into it further because it was just too complicated.

There are not many people who can build as complicated a mechanism as we have here.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is a tremendous project. I feel it will be successful. I think you will whip whatever problems you might encounter.

Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on this item?

Mr. JONAS. When do you contemplate having this in operation?

Admiral VIRDEN. In mid-1962, sir.

NAVAL RADIO STATION, WAHIAWA, HAWAII

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we shall pick up the Naval Radio Station at Wahiawa, Hawaii.

53984—60——39

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL RADIO STATION (RECEIVING)	WAHIAWA, OAHU, HAWAII	5293955

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTY/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
WAHIAWA, 2.5 MILES SOUTH	HONOLULU	CNO-DIRECTOR, NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS	14TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
COMMUNICATIONS ASHORE AND AFLOAT	1940	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

As an activity of the Naval Communication System, to manage, operate and maintain those facilities, equipments, devices, and systems, necessary to provide communications for the Naval Establishment ashore and afloat and such other communications as may be directed by the Chief of Naval Operations.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	47	508	28	5	40	628
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	67	678	64	7	40	856
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1964	70	718	64	7	40	899

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT -	PLANNED -	ULTIMATE -

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	700	133,000	16,883,000	17,016,000
2. LEASED	4	(-)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Cost)		17,016,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				5,162,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				357,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				6,308,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				28,843,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11
132	ANTENNAS	EA	41 (7 SUBSTANDARD)	*17	0	17	357	0	357	357
				* 10 NEW 7 REPLACEMENT						

85

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DAVDOCKS 2570 (7-58) Supersedes Feadocs 4080

BOOK NO. II PAGE NO. 69

(See note on following page.)

573

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by district public works officer, 14th Naval District, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and the selection of an architect and engineer is in process.

Admiral CHEW. The next project is for construction of antennas at the Naval Radio Station, Wahiawa, Oahu, Hawaii, at the estimated cost of $357,000. This is the receiver activity for the Naval Communication Station at Pearl Harbor. The project is for relocation and rebuilding of existing deteriorated and obsolete antennas and the construction of additional antennas needed for the operation of special radio equipment.

NAVAL RADIO STATION, WASHINGTON COUNTY, MAINE

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next is the Naval Radio Station in Washington County, Maine.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL RADIO STATION (TRANSMITTING)	WASHINGTON COUNTY, MAINE	H - 00108
4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	**5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY**	**6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE**	**7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA**
BANGOR - 60 MILES NORTH WEST	WASHINGTON	CNO - DIRECTOR, NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS	1ST NAVAL DISTRICT
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
RADIO TRANSMITTING STATION	1957	☐ MAINTENANCE ☐ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☒ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To provide very low frequency (VLF) transmitting facilities, in conjunction with the usual high frequency broadcast components, for the operation of submarine forces, surface forces and special communications operations in the North Atlantic and Arctic Seas.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT INIAT.OCCUP 6/60	3	5	1	0	24	33
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	5	48	70	0	86	209
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1962	5	72	80	0	86	243

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	-	PRESENT	-	PLANNED	-	ULTIMATE	-

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	2,786	80,000	57,000	137,000
2. LEASED	-	(-)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959 (Except Land Rent)				137,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				62,000,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST AMENDMENT ONLY				7,300,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				0
			7. GRAND TOTAL	69,565,000
				69,437,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11
132	VLF ANTENNA FACILITIES (2ND INCREMENT) (AMENDMENT)	NA	-	-	-	-	28,964	21,664	7,300	7,300

87

575

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
NAVDOCKS 2570 (7-58) *Supersedes Bandbook H-90*

BOOK NO. II PAGE NO. 70

(See note on following page.)

The final plans and specifications for this item have been completed by Robert & Co., Associates, Atlanta, Ga.

Admiral CHEW. The next project is also for funding an amendment to prior authorization. This is for an additional sum of $7,300,000 for construction of the second increment of the very low frequency facilities authorized for $21,664,000 in the fiscal year 1959 program by Public Law 85–685, at the Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine. Beginning in fiscal year 1956, this facility has been incrementally funded. The antenna radiation system is of radical and unique design, and its construction is without comparable precedent for size and complexity. To be operational the entire antenna facility must be constructed. There is an urgent military requirement for completion of the station by the start of the next calendar year, 1961.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice costs are up from $62.3 million last year to $69.5 million this year. What is the reason for this and when are we going to reach the end of the line on expenditures?

Admiral VIRDEN. This is a supplemental, Mr. Chairman. I would like to have Admiral Peltier cover that.

Admiral PELTIER. We now have firm prices on about 98 percent of this work so we know what the final cost of this project will be.

We have had an increase as requested here over and above the authorized amount to take care of the increased costs of the project. This is due to several factors.

One of the big increases has been the increase in wage rates. After the job started the Department of Labor made a new wage survey, and they raised the average wage as much as 100 percent.

On some of our roads it was rather difficult to determine just what kind of foundation we would have. I have a few pictures here to show you just what kind of a place we are working in.

We have a very dense growth which would not allow the architect-engineer to get as much information as they wanted. They missed their estimate considerably on the capability of the soil to carry some of this road. It required a considerable amount of additional cost.

The helix houses cost considerably more than planned. This is one of the largest radio stations that ever has been built, and the initial estimates for this were just not high enough.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the status of the plans for these facilities at the present time?

Admiral PELTIER. They are all complete and most of this work is under contract.

Mr. SHEPPARD. So far as you know, the plans are definite and completed?

Admiral PELTIER. We have bids on 98 percent of this work.

Mr. SHEPPARD. So far as you know at the present time will the funds for which you have asked complete the work?

Admiral PELTIER. Yes, Mr. Chairman. We are far enough along to make that statement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You do not think you will be confronted with another wage board ruling here between now and the time this is completed?

Admiral PELTIER. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What type of contingency factor do you have here?

Admiral PELTIER. Our contingency has gone down as we come nearer to completing the job. We might have as much as 3 percent left in this.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Supply the information for the record.

(The information requested follows:)

In the request for ammended authorization for construction of the VLF Maine in the amount of $7.3 million, a contingency of slightly under 4 percent of the estimated cost of all remaining unobligated work was included. Remaining unobligated work was in the approximate amount of $14 million.

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP, WINTER HARBOR, MAINE

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we come to the Naval Security Group, Winter Harbor, Maine.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL SECURITY GROUP ACTIVITY	WINTER HARBOR, MAINE	5771910

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
BANGOR, MAINE, 60 MILES NORTHWEST	HANCOCK	DIRECTOR, NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS CNO	1ST NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
COMMUNICATIONS AND SECURITY GROUP FUNCTIONS	1935	[ ] MAINTENANCE [X] ACTIVE [ ] INACTIVE [ ] NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To perform Naval Security Group functions as directed by the Chief of Naval Operations.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	8	179	4	0	0	191
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	8	179	4	0	0	191
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1962	10	209	4	0	0	223

NO. OF AIRCRAFT — PRESENT - PLANNED - ULTIMATE -

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	660	39,000	1,306,000	1,345,000
2. LEASED	-	(-)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		1,345,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				271,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				2,279,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				306,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				4,201,000

120

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION			PHYSICAL CAPACITY				AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
131	RADIO DIRECTION FINDER FACILITY	SF	0	20,800	0	20,800	2,279	0	2,279	2,279

86

878

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA

NAVDOCKS 2570 (7-58) Supersedes Navdocs 4080

BOOK NO. II PAGE NO. 71

Admiral CHEW. The ninth project is at the Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine, for construction of a radio direction finder facility at the estimated cost of $2,279,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have one line item here. What is the status of the plans for this facility and the equipment which is supposed to be used here?

Admiral PELTIER. Plans and specifications, Mr. Chairman, preliminary engineering completed by Metcalf & Eddy of Boston at a fee of $29,961, and final plans and specifications are authorized.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Generally speaking this line item is very much in accordance with others we have reviewed. Is that correct?

Admiral VIRDEN. Similar to the Skaggs Island project, Mr. Chairman.

NAVAL RADIO STATION, GUAM

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next project is the naval radio station at Guam.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL RADIO STATION (TRANSMITTING)	BARRIGADA, GUAM, MARIANA ISLANDS	5293117

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
AGANA (4 MILES WEST)	GUAM	CNO- DIRECTOR, NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS	MARIANA AREA

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
COMMUNICATIONS ASHORE AND AFLOAT	1945	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

As an activity of the Naval Communication System, to manage, operate and maintain those facilities, equipments, devices and systems, necessary to provide communications for the Naval Establishment ashore and afloat and such other communications as may be directed by the Chief of Naval Operations.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	4	52	0	0	41	97
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	4	52	0	0	41	97
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1962	4	52	0	0	41	97

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	PLANNED	ULTIMATE
	-	-	-

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	2,922	143,000	4,084,000	4,227,000
2. LEASED	-	(-)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Cost)		4,227,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				68,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				1,222,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				5,517,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
132	ANTENNAS	EA	131	2	0	2	68	0	68	68

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA

NAVDOCKS 2570 (7-58) Supersedes DoDDoc 4080

BOOK NO. II PAGE NO. 72

580

80

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by officer in charge of construction, Marianas, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by the officer in charge of construction, Marianas.

Admiral CHEW. There are seven unclassified line items at six overseas stations in this group for a total amount of $2,826,000.

The first unclassified project is at the Naval Radio Station, Barrigada, Guam, in the Mariana Islands, for construction of antennas at the estimated cost of $68,000. This item is required for direct, directional, more powerful and optimum communications for control-and-command of 7th Fleet units operating in the highly strategic area between Japan and the South China Sea. Utilizing powerful radio transmitters already installed, the antennas to be provided by this project will permit simultaneous radio-teletypewriter communications which will link the commander of the 7th Fleet to the commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet and the Chief of Naval Operations via Naval Communication Station, Guam. This project is urgently required for fleet operations in a vital area not adequately covered by existing antennas.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is this item in proportion to items of like character to which you have referred?

Admiral VIRDEN. Yes, sir. This, Mr. Chairman, is an antenna to give fleet coverage in the area west of Guam, an area which has been deficient in the ship to shore operations in the past.

NAVAL RADIO STATION, FINEGAYEN, GUAM

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now pick up the Naval Radio Station, Finegayen, Guam.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL RADIO STATION (RECEIVING)	FINEGAYEN, GUAM, MARIANA ISLANDS	5293326
4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	**5. COUNTRY/COUNTRY**	**6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE**	**7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA**
AGANA - 10 MILES SOUTHWEST	GUAM	CNO-DIRECTOR, NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS	MARIANA AREA
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
COMMUNICATIONS ASHORE AND AFLOAT	1944	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

As an activity of the Naval Communication System, to manage, operate and maintain those facilities, equipments, devices and systems, necessary to provide communications for the Naval Establishment ashore and afloat and such other communications as may be directed by the Chief of Naval Operations.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	49	733	171	0	81	1,034
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	49	733	171	0	81	1,034
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	49	761	171	0	81	1,062

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT -	PLANNED -	ULTIMATE -

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	4,799	393,000	9,528,000	9,921,000
2. LEASED	-	-	-	
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959 (Except Land Cost)				9,921,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				11,787,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				469,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				12,208,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				34,385,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
131	RADIO RECEIVER FACILITY	SF	0	1,845	0	1,845	469	0	469	469

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by officer in charge of construction, Marianas, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and the selection of an architect and engineer is in process.

The second project is at the Naval Radio Station, Finegayen, Guam, for construction of a radio receiver facility at the estimated cost of $469,000. This station is the receiving activity of the Naval Communication Station, Guam. The project is for construction of a receiver building, new antennas and an emergency generator plant.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This in general has the same requirement as those previously testified to?

Admiral VIRDEN. Yes, sir.

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP ACTIVITY, CANAL ZONE

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now, we come to the Naval Security Group Activity in the Canal Zone.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL SECURITY GROUP ACTIVITY	GALETA ISLAND, CANAL ZONE	5293335

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTY/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
CRISITOBAL - 5 MILES SOUTHWEST	CANAL ZONE	CNO - DIRECTOR, NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS	15TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
COMMUNICATIONS AND SECURITY GROUP FUNCTIONS	1952	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To perform Naval Security Group functions as directed by the Chief of Naval Operations.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	1	28	2	0	0	31
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	2	30	2	0	0	34
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1962	3	55	2	0	0	60

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	PLANNED	ULTIMATE
	-	-	-

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	2,895	0	112,000	112,000
2. LEASED	-	(-)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Cost)		112,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				1,750,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				200,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				2,062,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
131	RADIO DIRECTION FINDER FACILITY	SF	1,565 (SUBSTANDARD)	10,950	0	10,950	1,750	0	1,750	1,750

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
NAVDOCKS 2570 (7-58) Supersedes NavDocks 4080

BOOK NO. II PAGE NO. 74

584

79

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Guy B. Panero, New York, N.Y., at a fee of $36,250, and is presently being reviewed prior to authorization of final plans and specifications.

Admiral CHEW. The third project is at the Naval Security Group Activity, Galeta Island, C.Z., for construction of a Radio Direction Finder Facility at the estimated cost of $1,750,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There is on line item reflected here. With all the problems the United States is having in the Canal Zone at the present time, what consideration have you given to locating this facility outside of the zone at perhaps some more convenient or more acceptable location?

Admiral VIRDEN. Mr. Chairman, we have given this very serious consideration. I have asked about this on a trip to the Canal Zone I made myself.

I just got a report on it from the Inspector General yesterday morning, and it was their opinion that this particular station at Galeta Island is in a strong position. It is on the Atlantic side.

They are surrounded by various military installations down there; the security is good. During the disturbances that have occurred in the past the discipline in the Atlantic end of the Canal Zone has been very good. They have had no indication of any difficulty whatsoever, so it is the feeling that they are in very solid there.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Insofar as the location is concerned, and based upon your response, it is in a more logical defense area than other locations might be; is that your conclusion?

Admiral VIRDEN. I would say that this location is as favorable a location as we can get in the Canal Zone, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions?

Mr. JONAS. What rights do we have in Galeta?

Admiral VIRDEN. The original treaty rights.

Mr. JONAS. Is there anything on the island except our own installation?

Admiral VIRDEN. Here is a picture of it, sir. It is connected with the zone by a causeway.

Mr. JONAS. It is not actually an island; is it?

Admiral VIRDEN. No, sir. There is not much more than a half mile between this installation and the old one which it will replace.

Mr. JONAS. You are building this in a separate location from the existing one?

Admiral VIRDEN. The only separate location is to put a new antenna there while still being able to use the old one. There is no complete replacement of everything.

Mr. JONAS. Where are the supporting activities?

Admiral VIRDEN. The operational activities are colocated. The supporting activities are those at nearby military installations.

The Army and the Coco Solo station, the old naval station now in a caretaker's status, to some extent provide support.

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP, TURKEY

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now pick up the Naval Security Group in Turkey.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL SECURITY GROUP ACTIVITY	KARAMURSEL, TURKEY	-

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
ISTANBUL, 37 MILES NORTHWEST	TURKEY	CNO - DIRECTOR, NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS	EASTERN ATLANTIC AND MEDITERRANEAN

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
COMMUNICATIONS & SECURITY GROUP FUNCTIONS	1957	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To perform Naval Security Group functions as directed by the Chief of Naval Operations.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	28	411	0	0	0	439
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	32	495	0	0	0	527
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1962	32	495	0	0	0	527

NO. OF AIRCRAFT — PRESENT - PLANNED - ULTIMATE -

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	0*	-	340,000	340,000
2. LEASED	-	(-)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except land rent)		340,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				105,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				84,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				70,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				599,000

*TENANT OF AIR FORCE

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11
131	RECEIVER BUILDING	SF	19,200	6,000	0	6,000	84	0	84	84

171

586

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Area Public Works officer, Eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean Area, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and will be completed under the supervision of the Army, Corps of Engineers, Southern District Office, Leghorn, Italy.

Admiral CHEW. The fourth project is at another Naval Security Group activity, at Karamursel, Turkey, where we propose to provide a receiver building at the estimated cost of $34,000. The need for this facility is generated by the programed increase in functions at this activity. To keep pace with this increase additional operational space is required to permit installation of on-board and projected equipment. More space is also required for communication-terminal equipment, for the processing functions, and for electronics- and teletype-repair shops. The proposed facility will satisfy these requirements.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This has one line item. I would assume this is in the same general field to which you have previously testified. Is that correct?

Admiral VIRDEN. You are correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If there are exceptions to anything in this presentation to anything indicated earlier show it in the record.

NAVAL RADIO STATION, MARTIN PENA, P.R.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next is the Naval Radio Station, Martin Pena, P.R.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL RADIO STATION (TRANSMITTING)	MARTIN PENA, PUERTO RICO	5293520
4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	**5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY**	**6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE**	**7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA**
SANTURCE - ADJACENT TO NORTH BOUNDARY	PUERTO RICO	DIRECTOR, NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS	10TH NAVAL DISTRICT
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
COMMUNICATIONS - ASHORE AND AFLOAT	1944	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

As an activity of the Naval Communication System to manage, operate and maintain those facilities, equipments, devices and systems necessary to provide communications for the Naval Establishment ashore and afloat, and for such other communications as may be directed by the Chief of Naval Operations.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	1	21	5	0	0	27
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	1	21	5	0	0	27
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1961	1	21	5	0	0	27

NO. OF AIRCRAFT — PRESENT - PLANNED - ULTIMATE -

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	274	0	743,000	743,000
2. LEASED	-	(-)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959 (Excess Land Cost)				743,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				72,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				180,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				995,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11
132	ANTENNAS	EA	22	7	0	7	72	0	72	72

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DD FORM 1390 (7-58) Supersedes Previous Edition

BOOK NO. II PAGE NO. 76

588

81

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by area public works officer, Caribbean, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and the selection of an architect and engineer is in process.

Admiral CHEW. The fifth project, like the first overseas communication project at Barrigada, Guam, which I previously described, is for construction of new antennas at the estimated cost of $72,000, at the Naval Radio Station, Martin Pena, P.R. This is the transmitter activity for the Naval Communication Station at San Juan. The new antennas are needed to provide for fleet communications in an area of antisubmarine warfare operations and missile testing. The antennas are necessary for use on ship-to-shore circuits which require omnidirectional capability for best results.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Again we find another line item in the same general category of others presented.

Is this a component part of like facilities about which you have testified earlier?

Admiral VIRDEN. Yes, Mr. Chairman. This is part of the naval communications system.

NAVAL RADIO FACILITY, SAN MIGUEL, PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next is the naval radio facility at San Miguel, Philippine Islands.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL RADIO FACILITY (RECEIVING)	SAN MIGUEL, LUZON, REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES	5245725
4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	**5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY**	**6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE**	**7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA**
OLONGAPO 24 MILES SOUTHEAST	ZAMBALES PROVINCE	DIRECTOR NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS	PHILIPPINE AREA
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
COMMUNICATIONS, ASHORE AND AFLOAT	1957	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

As an activity of the Naval Communication System, to manage, operate and maintain those facilities, equipments, devices and systems, necessary to provide communications for the Naval Establishment ashore and afloat and such other communications as may be directed by the Chief of Naval Operations.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	60	753	119	0	101	1,033
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	60	764	119	0	101	1,044
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1962	60	643	119	0	101	923

NO. OF AIRCRAFT — PRESENT: - — PLANNED: - — ULTIMATE: -

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	-	-	-	0
2. LEASED	2,258	[-]	9,567,000	9,567,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		9,567,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				17,159,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				383,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				9,000,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				36,109,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)				
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11	
131	EXPANSION OF TERMINAL BUILDING	SF	15,188	5,408	0	5,408	142	0	142	142	82
811	EXPANSION OF ELECTRIC POWER SUPPLY	KW	2,700	675	0	675	241	0	241	241	83
								TOTAL	383	383	

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
NAVDOCKS 2570 (7-58) Supersedes NavDocks 4030

BOOK NO. II PAGE NO. 17

390

EXPANSION OF TERMINAL BUILDING

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Engineering & Development Corp., Manila, Philippines, at a fee of $3,000, and is complete.
The final plans and specifications have been authorized and selection of an architectural and engineering firm is expected at an early date.

EXPANSION OF ELECTRIC POWER SUPPLY

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Adrian Wilson & Associates, Los Angeles, Calif., at a fee of $3,180, and is complete.
The final plans and specifications have been authorized and selection of an architectural and engineering firm is expected at an early date.

ADMIRAL CHEW. The last of the unclassified projects consists of two line items at the Naval Radio Facility, San Miguel, on Luzon Island of the Republic of the Philippines for the total amount of $383,000. This is a receiver activity. It is our most westerly station in the Pacific and provides an invaluable communication link for the 7th Fleet with all our activities in the Pacific.

The first line item is for terminal building expansion, at a cost of $142,000. Since this facility was activated in July 1957, additional operational circuits to the 7th Fleet have had to be added. This has required installation of additional electronic equipment which has caused overcrowding of all operational space in the Terminal Building. Consequently, the reliability, security and speed of communications are adversely affected. The additional space to be provided by extending the existing Terminal Building will relieve this adverse condition.

The second line item is for expansion of the electric power supply at the estimated cost of $241,000. The increased electric-power load has resulted from the increased electronic communication equipment, the construction of six family housing units, additional shops, and other normal increased demands which were not contemplated in the original design of the facility. These increases have developed as a result of the increasing importance to fleet operations of this strategic area. The proposed extension of the powerplant and the installation of a diesel-electric generating unit will meet the total requirement of this facility insofar as can now be foreseen.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This is a new station which has not been opened for very long?

Admiral VIRDEN. Initial occupancy 1957, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are you now finding that your facilities there are inadequate to meet your requirements?

Admiral VIRDEN. Mr. Chairman, the occasion for these new requirements arose as the result of the Taiwan situation in part. At that time we found that the station as conceived in its original design had not provided for the communications required to support all those extensive naval operations which took place during the Taiwan affair.

There were many emergency measures taken during that affair to reinforce the communications of the area.

This program that we have here now should put us in a more solid position for similar difficulties in that area of the world in the future.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I note in your breakdown, shown on page 77–A, under the last supporting features, roads, walks, and so on, various items. Is there anything unusual here?

Admiral VIRDEN. Arrangements with the Philippine Government with respect to this have been completed.

YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we shall pick up the projects in the Yards and Docks Facilities area.

Please insert in the record at this point the summary sheet and statement with respect thereto.

(The matter referred to follows:)

Yards and Docks Facilities, outside the United States

Installation and Line Item	Proposed funding	Fiscal year authorization
Public Works Center, Guam, Mariana Islands: Improvements to power system and acquisition of land (1st increment)	$10,947,000	1960
Total, Yards and Docks Facilities	10,947,000	

The appropriation requested in this program for shore facilities under the Bureau of Yards and Docks sponsorship is $10,947,000 for one line item; namely, "Improvements to power system and acquisition of land (1st increment)," Public Works Center, Guam, Marianas Islands.

This item proposes the construction of a 20,000-kilowatt conventional type steam electric generating plant at the Public Works Center, Guam, M.I., which was authorized under Public Law 86–149 of August 10, 1959.

Under current DOD arrangements the Navy is responsible for the generation and distribution of power on the island of Guam. In view of the inadequacies of the existing plant and distribution system, action has been initiated to provide emergency generating support to cover the requirements pending construction of the presently authorized first increment of 20,000-kilowatt conventional plant and attendant facilities.

PUBLIC WORKS CENTER, GUAM

The first item under this category is the Public Works Center at Guam.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1962 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
PUBLIC WORKS CENTER	GUAM	5118400
4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	**5. COUNTY/COUNTRY**	**6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE**	**7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA**
AGANA - 6 MILES NORTHEAST	MARIANA ISLANDS	BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS	MARIANA AREA
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
MAINTENANCE OF PUBLIC WORKS	1949	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To provide public works, public utilities and transportation support, including engineering and administrative services incident thereto, as directed by competent authority.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JULY 1959	13	1	1,710	0	0	1,724
2. PLANNED - END FY 1960	13	1	1,715	0	0	1,729
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1961	13	1	1,715	0	0	1,729

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	PLANNED	ULTIMATE

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	4,816	467,000	115,392,000	115,859,000
2. LEASED	637	(86,194)	39,703,000	39,703,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except land items)		155,562,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				10,947,000*
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				0
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				42,037,000
			7. GRAND TOTAL	208,546,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE 1	LINE ITEM TITLE 2	UNIT 3	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 4	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED 5	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 6	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 7	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES 8	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 9	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 10	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED 11
811	IMPROVEMENTS TO POWER SYSTEM AND ACQUISITION OF LAND (1ST INCREMENT)	KW	58,300 (23,800 SUBSTANDARD)	40,000	20,000	0	20,073**	10,947*	0	10,947*

*Does not include Government of Guam costs estimated to be $1,917,000
**Does not include Government of Guam costs estimated to be $3,416,000

172

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA

BOOK NO. II PAGE NO. 78

(See note on following page.)

The complete engineering study for this item was prepared by the Rogers Engineering Co., Inc., San Francisco, Calif., and is complete.

Final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Mendenhall and Sargent & Lundy, Los Angeles, Calif.

Admiral CHEW. The final facilities class in the program is Yards and Docks Facilities. The Bureau is responsible for fulfilling the Navy's requirements in the broad field of civil engineering at all shore activities. This includes the technical responsibility for design, planning, development, alteration and maintenance of public works, public utilities, and construction and base transportation facilities throughout the Naval Shore Establishment.

This class includes one project for the first increment of improvements to the power system and acquisition of land at the estimated cost of $10,947,000 at the Public Works Center, Guam. This project was authorized last year but was not approved for funding. The Navy is responsible for the generation and distribution of electrical power on the Island of Guam. This responsibility includes the requirements of the Navy, Air Force and civilian community. The total predicted demand of the various activities, based on current surveys of existing and planned facilities, is 47,533 kilowatts for 1960; 52,733 kilowatts for 1963; and 57,777 kilowatts for 1965. With a firm generating capacity of 45,500 kilowatts and an inadequate distribution system, we estimate there will be shortages of 2,033 kilowatts in 1960; 7,233 kilowatts in 1963; and 12,277 kilowatts in 1965. The Government of Guam has agreed to participate proportionally in the funding based on a use factor. The estimated cost to the Government of Guam for the first increment is $1,917,000. The power deficiency is now so serious that the Navy is preparing for temporary emergency measures to boost the generation by 10,000 kilowatts.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the basis for your cost estimates for this facility?

Admiral PELTIER. This present estimate will be reduced, Mr. Chairman. We are relocating this plant from Tumon to Piti. Total cost has been reduced from $12.864 to $11.5 million.

We have also negotiated with the Island of Guam Government a larger percentage of their participation. They will now participate to the extent of about 36 percent, roughly $2,736,000, so our request will be reduced to $8,784,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What consideration have you given to using a nuclear reactor for the entire power requirement here?

Admiral CHEW. I appeared before the Joint Atomic Energy Committee on that problem. At that time the consideration for the use of a nuclear reactor was questioned.

The basic consideration, that is consideration for a future increment in this particular case, is the urgency of the requirement which dictates primarily the use of a conventional plant. It will not meet the total requirement and in the second increment it is planned to have a nuclear reactor. That will come in 1962.

Admiral PELTIER. This is fairly firmed now with the Atomic Energy Commission and the Joint Atomic Energy Committee of the Congress.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is your appraisal of the total estimated cost for the total power requirement here?

Admiral CHEW. Twenty thousand kilowatts.

Admiral PELTIER. The latest estimate we have on a plant of this size at this location is about $19 million.

We feel a conventional plant would cost about $8.5 million. We have now tentatively agreed with the AEC they would furnish $10.5 million of the $19 million and we will come in for $8.5 million. These figures are subject to change later on as we develop firmer costs.

Mr. JONAS. Have you similar arrangements about sharing of costs with the Government of Guam for future increments?

Admiral PELTIER. We have not negotiated anything on the nuclear plant with the Government of Guam.

Mr. JONAS. Does the arrangement contemplate sharing of maintenance costs?

Admiral PELTIER. We will maintain and operate the plant. Their rate will reflect this cost of operation, depreciation of our capital investment, less, of course, what they put in.

In other words, the rate will be negotiated on that basis, that they will pay a return to the Government or a capitalization of this plant.

Mr. JONAS. That is all.

Admiral, I have one additional question about this powerplant at Guam before we go on to the continuing authorizations.

The participation of the government of Guam in this $11½ million item is 36 percent of $7,600,000.

Admiral PELTIER. 36 percent of the $11,500,000, Mr. Jonas.

Mr. JONAS. No.

Admiral CHEW. We have a new sheet.

Mr. JONAS. The new sheet says 36 percent of $7,600,000, which amounts to $2,736,000.

Admiral PELTIER. That is right. The $11.5 million includes a considerable amount of distribution systems.

Mr. JONAS. I was trying to arrive at how you get the base figure of $7,600,000 to figure Guam's participation.

Admiral PELTIER. You are right, sir.

Admiral CHEW. The answer is, because part of it is for distribution lines for which the government of Guam will not have to pay.

Mr. JONAS. What part of this new 20,000 kilowatt capacity will go to Guam, if you have that information?

Admiral PELTIER. It will all be in the system, Mr. Jonas. In other words, you will not be able to identify any particular part. It will be part of a distribution system.

Mr. JONAS. What will be their total use?

Admiral PELTIER. I have their total load here. As of today, the government of Guam, on a total load of 47,533 kilowatts, are using 14,667 kilowatts or 30.8 percent. By 1965 they will go up to 20,889 kilowatts of a total of 57,777 kilowatts, or 36.2 percent. In other words, this 36 percent is based on when this plant will be in operation, not today.

Mr. JONAS. That was the basis on which you figured Guam's participation at 36 percent?

Admiral PELTIER. That is right.

Mr. JONAS. Do you feel that is an equitable distribution of costs?

Admiral PELTIER. Yes. We have had discussions with the Guam people, and they are agreeable to this.

Mr. JONAS. I just wanted the record to show that we are not building this powerplant primarily for the people of Guam, and that their participation in the cost is roughly equivalent to their use of the power.

Admiral PELTIER. That is right.

Mr. JONAS. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

CONTINUING AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. SIKES. Now, pick up continuing authorizations.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 2 MARCH 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
CONTINUING AUTHORIZATIONS	VARIOUS LOCATIONS	-

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
-	-	BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS	-

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
PLANNING AND SPECIAL CONSTRUCTION	-	☐ MAINTENANCE ☐ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To provide for accomplishment of items which have Navy-wide application and no appropriation limitation.

Functions included are:

1. Construction of minor items not deferrable until enactment of new legislation.
2. Replacement or repair of damaged property to fulfill current operating missions.
3. Design and off-site construction for Capehart housing.
4. Improvement or demolition of inadequate public Quarters.
5. Provision of support finances for construction of Commodity Credit Housing.
6. Provision of off-station highways for ingress and egress to Naval installations.
7. Acquisition by lease for indefinite periods of time real property in the Ryukyu Islands.
8. Engineer planning for military construction.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT						
2. PLANNED - END FY						
3. ULTIMATE - END FY						

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	PLANNED	ULTIMATE
	-		

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	CONSTRUCTION COSTS TO BE INCLUDED IN INVEN-			-
2. LEASED	TORY OF INSTALLATION RECEIVING BENEFIT			-
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY _____		(Except Land Cost)		-
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				-
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				-
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				-
7. GRAND TOTAL				-

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)				
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED	
1	2	3	6	8	6	7	8	9	10	11	
	MINOR CONSTRUCTION	NA	-	-	CONTINUOUS	-	-	-	-	4,000	1
	RESTORATION OF DAMAGED FACILITIES	NA	-	-	CONTINUOUS	-	-	-	-	3,000	2
	CAPEHART HOUSING SUPPORT	NA	-	-	CONTINUOUS	-	-	-	-	3,000	120
711	CORRECTION OF INADEQUATE PUBLIC QUARTERS	NA	-	-	CONTINUOUS	-	-	-	-	1,750	119
711	COMMODITY CREDIT HOUSING SUPPORT	NA	-	-	CONTINUOUS	-	-	-	-	250	121
851	ACCESS ROADS	NA	-	-	CONTINUOUS	-	-	-	-	1,500	4
923	ADVANCE LAND RENTAL-RYUKYU ISLANDS, OKINAWA	NA	-	-	CONTINUOUS	-	-	-	-	2,500	122
1000	PLANNING AND DESIGN	NA	-	-	CONTINUOUS	-	-	-	-	9,500	3
								TOTAL		25,500	

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA

DD FORM 2576 (7-58) Supersedes Previous Issue

BOOK NO. II PAGE NO. 70

597

MINOR NEW CONSTRUCTION

I think, Admiral, if you would run through these items and tell us what is involved in this matter, it would be helpful.

Admiral CHEW. The first project is for minor construction, for which funding approval is requested in the amount of $4 million. This amount is required to fund such special projects during the fiscal year 1961, each costing over $25,000 but not more than $200,000, for which the need could not be foreseen in time to include them in the annual military construction program, but which are so urgently required that financing should not be deferred for another year.

These projects are generated by many factors, including increased workload, need for increased safety or efficiency. This permanent authorization was granted in section 408 of Public Law 968, 84th Congress.

Mr. SIKES. I would like you to place in the record a tabulation showing the projects approved for fiscal year 1960 and those in process at the present time.

I would like you to provide for the record a listing of your obligations for this work in each of the last 5 years.

(The information requested follows:)

Minor new construction

Projects approved, fiscal year 1960:	
NFC Cleveland: EDPM alterations	$55,000
NA Annapolis: Footbridge, construction of	44,200
NPGS Monterey: Navy numerical weather prediction project	122,617
NS Charleston:	
Dockside electrical facility	121,500
Clean room facility	32,300
NAF Sigonella: Classified	46,000
NS Midway: Contour modifications	110,000
NWS Yorktown: Sheds 5 and 6, alterations	196,000
BUDOCKS: EDPM alterations	98,000
NSY Long Beach: EDPM alterations	88,600
NSB New London: Alter building No. 151	62,000
MCAS Beaufort: Full pressure suit facility	58,000
NH Philadelphia: Boilers, procurement and installation	198,660
GSSO Philadelphia: EDPM installation	165,000
NS New Orleans: Eighty-second publication and printing office	76,500
NS Pearl Harbor: Additional electrical power	79,000
NS Newport: Relocation service craft department	142,879
PWC Guam: 10,000-kilowatt mobile power train installation	45,000
NSY Charleston: Polaris-controlled environment space	97,000
Total	1,838,256
Projects pending approval, fiscal year 1960:	
NSB Pearl Harbor: Classified	183,000
NSY Long Beach: Install booster pump	188,000
NTC Great Lakes: Relocation of commissary stores	190,500
NAS Key West: Fuel storage and distribution	192,000
NCTC Corry Field: Messhall alteration	85,100
NAS Alameda: EDPM installation	114,000
MCSC Barstow: Modification of roof trusses, warehouses	177,000
NASA Stockton: Direct-current electric power AS–13, Pacific Reserve Fleet	25,200
NAS Atsugi: Addition to parking apron	183,000
NAF Sigonella: Operation and supply facility	28,500
Taiwan: Hospital addition	199,990
NSY Philadelphia: Air conditioning of building No. 619	140,000
Total	1,706,290
Grand total	3,544,546

5-year obligation history

Fiscal year 1955	0
Fiscal year 1956	0
Fiscal year 1957	$510, 312. 00
Fiscal year 1958	603, 904. 19
Fiscal year 1959	3, 464, 030. 79
Total	4, 578, 246. 98

Mr. SIKES. Are there questions, Mr. Jonas, on minor new construction?

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

RESTORATION OF DAMAGED FACILITIES

Mr. SIKES. The next item is "Restoration of damaged facilities," for which $3 million is requested. Admiral, will you state the requirement, please?

Admiral CHEW. The second project is for repair and replacement of damaged facilities for which funding approval is requested in the amount of $3 million. This provides readily available funds for the repair or replacement of facilities which have been damaged or destroyed by fire or such acts of God as storms, hurricanes, floods, and so forth. In most cases where these funds are used, the repair or replacement of the damaged facilities is needed as soon as possible, to protect life or Government property.

Authorization for such work is contained in section 407 of Public Law 968, 84th Congress.

Mr. SIKES. I would like you to prepare for the record a tabulation showing funds available for this work, pending projects, and the actual replacement of facilities contemplated in fiscal year 1960.

I would like you to prepare for the record a table which shows the annual obligations under this program for the past 5 years.

(The information requested follows:)

Replacement of damaged facilities

Projects approved fiscal year 1960:	
NSB Guantanamo: EM recreation building, fire damage	$612,000
MCAS Beaufort: "Gracie" damage—miscellaneous damage	725,000
NAD Concord: Quality evaluation lab—fire damaged	53,000
NS Charleston: "Gracie" damage—to roofs	189,840
MCRD Parris Island: "Gracie" damage to electricity distribution systems	181,044
DC Taiwan: "Billie" damage to hospital	125,000
MCSC Barstow: Barracks destroyed by fire	257,300
Camp Butler: Typhoons, miscellaneous damage	134,617
Subtotal	2,277,801
Approved projects carried into fiscal year 1960 unfunded:	
NAS Patuxent: Barracks—132-man partially destroyed by fire	321,200
NS Treasure Island: Theater destroyed by fire	372,000
NS Pearl Harbor: Commissioned officers mess—destroyed by fire	750,000
Subtotal	1,443,200
Projects pending approval, fiscal year 1960:	
NAF Naha: Typhoon Charlotte—miscellaneous damage	63,525
NTC Great Lakes: Storm damage—miscellaneous damage caused by high winds	24,000
NFA Sasebo: 10-man station brig destroyed by fire	30,000
NCF Kami Seya: Typhoon Vera—miscellaneous damage	14,000
NS Kodiak: Aviation stores warehouse—repair of roof trusses	74,200
NFA Sasebo: Typhoon Sarah—miscellaneous damage	94,000
NS Treasure Island: Recreational facilities destroyed by fire	580,000
Subtotal	879,725
Total	4,600,726
Fiscal year 1960 appropriation	4,000,000
Balance	—600,726

5-year obligation history

Fiscal year 1955	$2,057,842.67
Fiscal year 1956	4,349,906.66
Fiscal year 1957	7,161,036.67
Fiscal year 1958	4,263,181.83
Fiscal year 1959	2,318,019.21
Total	20,149,987.04

Mr. SIKES. Any questions, Mr. Jonas?

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

CAPEHART HOUSING SUPPORT

Mr. SIKES. Under Capehart housing support, there is a request for $3 million. Will you discuss that?

Admiral CHEW. These funds are requested to defray expenses for preparation of plans and specifications, land acquisition, and construction of offsite utilities for authorized Capehart housing. Authorization for this purpose was granted by Public Law 155, 82d Congress.

The Capehart housing which will require this support is covered in this year's military construction authorization bill for 3,790 units at 10 locations in the United States.

At this point, sir, I think it appropriate to mention that there is an additional 500 units in process of approval for the city of New

York, and that will be an amendment to be presented when the authorization bill comes up, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Would you submit for the record the specific projects which are involved in this appropriation? How many projects are there?

Admiral CHEW. We have them, and I will run through them quickly. (Off the record.)

(The information requested follows:)

Navy's Capehart housing in fiscal year 1961 military construction authorization program

	Unit
Naval Air Station, Alameda, Calif	900
Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, Calif	400
Naval Station, Charleston, S.C	500
Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill	250
Naval Station, Mayport, Fla	500
Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tenn	500
Naval Post Graduate School, Monterey, Calif	250
Naval Air Station, Oceana, Va	40
Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, Calif	300
Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, Calif	150
Total	3,790

Mr. SIKES. Have you made any provisions in this program for the construction of community facilities with mortgage proceeds?

Admiral CHEW. I would have to provide that for the record.

(The information requested follows:)

No provision has been made in the fiscal year 1961 Capehart program for construction of community facilities.

Mr. SIKES. What is the present status of the Navy Capehart program in general?

Admiral PELTIER. Mr. Chairman, we have through 1960 approved for construction 15,145 units. We have under construction or completed as of January 1, 10,746 units. We have 4,360 to be placed under contract by the end of this fiscal year, which in the Capehart happen to be extended to September 30 because of the law. Then there are 3,790 to be placed by the end of 1961.

Mr. SIKES. How frequently do you review the requirement in order to determine whether there has been construction by private interests in the nearby local communities which eliminates some of the need for Capehart housing?

Admiral CHEW. Mr. Sikes, we are continually reviewing that. I might add for the record that where community support is forthcoming, we do definitely prefer not to build Capehart. It is only where it is urgently required. As I say, that requirement is continually reviewed.

Mr. SIKES. Do you foresee that the new section 810 in the most recent housing bill will be of any significant benefit to the Navy in its housing problems?

Admiral CHEW. I think it could be a benefit in certain areas.

Mr. SIKES. Of course, it was designed to provide rental housing. We never have been able to get a good rental program in areas where there is a need for housing for military personnel. This was intended to meet that requirement. Whether it will do it successfully or not, we do not know.

Admiral CHEW. We do not know, sir, and as a matter of actual fact, we are requesting at the present time one small project more as a pilot to determine whether it will in fact be adequate for our needs.

Mr. SIKES. A strange thing to us in the Congress is that we passed this bill last summer, and the regulations which are to govern the issuance of section 810 commitments under this bill have not yet been forthcoming from the Department of Defense, when this section was designed to help the Department of Defense. We find it difficult to understand why so much time has been required to implement the regulations.

Admiral CHEW. We have submitted one project with the request to the Department of Defense that whatever administrative procedures have to be followed be determined so we can have this one project.

Mr. SIKES. Have your people given enough thought to it or have you studied it enough to come up with an opinion as to the workability of the section?

Admiral CHEW. I would give a horseback opinion, sir. As I say, in certain areas I think it will be feasible. In other areas I think there is a possibility of another Wherry.

Mr. SIKES. What would be the principal limiting factors in the section as you see them now?

Admiral CHEW. I think the principal factors would be the inability of a private contractor to build and rent for the BAQ that is available. That is the major stumbling block. That would, of course, vary with the particular area in which the quarters would be constructed.

Mr. SIKES. I heard the statement made that we in the South may be in better position to benefit from this or to take advantage of it because construction is somewhat less costly there.

Admiral CHEW. That is true, sir; and our one project is in the South, sir.

CORRECTION OF INADEQUATE PUBLIC QUARTERS

Mr. SIKES. The next subtitle is "Correction of Inadequate Quarters," for which $1,750,000 is requested. May we have your discussion of that requirement, please?

Admiral CHEW. Authorization for this purpose is contained in section 407 of Public Law 85–241, as amended, which requires that the quarters be made adequate for family use or be disposed of by removal from the plant account. The inadequacies may be in the available space, design, structural condition, or a combination of such factors.

It is currently plannned to use these funds for making approximately 660 sets of quarters adequate and to demolish about 1,200 units which would be economically infeasible of being made adequate.

Mr. SIKES. What is the present status of the Navy's program to improve inadequate quarters?

Admiral CHEW. We are making every effort to adhere to the spirit of the law to make them adequate or to tear them down. Those which we have planned for rehabilitation this year are 400 units at Cherry Point, 12 units at Newport, 2 units at Earle, N.J., 6 units at Philadelphia, 3 units at Mechanicsburg, 7 units at Keyport, and 176 units at the Armed Forces Staff College.

Mr. SIKES. Is this estimate based on correcting these quarters by July 1, 1961, or January 1, 1962?

Admiral CHEW. I think in the case of the Armed Forces Staff College, it will be 1962. The others would be 1961. I would have to check that.

Admiral PELTIER. The law expires July 1, 1961.

Admiral CHEW. The law expires, I think in the case of the Armed Forces Staff College, there is a request for continuation. That is a special case, sir.

COMMODITY CREDIT HOUSING SUPPORT

Mr. SIKES. Under "Commodity Credit Housing Support" there is a request for $250,000. Will you discuss that requirement, please?

Admiral CHEW. Authorization for this purpose was granted in section 411(b) of Public Law 968 of the 84th Congress. That law authorized the construction of family housing in foreign locations by financing the cost from proceeds of Commodity Credit operations. It also authorized up to 25 percent of the cost to be financed from military construction appropriations.

Included in the fiscal year 1961 military construction authorization bill are 127 units of such housing. Twenty-seven are at Golcuk, Turkey. One hundred are at the Naval Station at Rota, Spain, for which the proposed dollar support is requested.

Mr. SIKES. What is the status of the local funds available for construction of this housing?

Admiral CHEW. As I understand it, the funds are available for construction of this housing, and we must pay the money back to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. SIKES. What type of contracting do you propose to enter into for the construction of the housing in Spain?

Admiral PELTIER. The housing in Spain could be done by two methods. One would be lump-sum competitive bids, or it could be accomplished by Seabees. It has not been finally determined.

ACCESS ROADS

Mr. SIKES. Will you tell us about your requirement for $1½ million for access roads?

Admiral CHEW. Authorization for this purpose was granted in Public Law 295 of the 77th Congress, as amended by Public Law 769 of the 81st Congress.

Access roads are needed to replace or relocate public highways whose public use is destroyed by the construction of Naval or Marine Corps activities, and for new entrances and exits for such activities. The funds will be transferred to the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, when construction of an access road is to be started.

Examples of access road requirements in the 1961 program are at the Naval Missile Facility, Point Arguello, and the Naval Ordnance Laboratory, Fort Lauderdale, Fla., the Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, the Naval Air Station, Brunswick, for the Capehart housing, the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, and at its outlying field, and at the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, for the Capehart housing project.

Mr. SIKES. Is this your complete list as you see it now?

Admiral CHEW. This is our complete list as we see it now.

Mr. SIKES. Will you submit that list for the record?
Admiral CHEW. I certainly will.
(The information requested follows:)

ACCESS ROAD REQUIREMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1961

Naval Missile Facility, Point Arguello, Calif.
Naval Ordnance Laboratory test facility, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.
Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine
Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine—Capehart housing
Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Miss.—Capehart housing
Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Miss.—Outlying field (BRAVO)
Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Fla.—Capehart housing

Mr. SIKES. What consideration has been given to the recommendation of this committee that the problems of financing access roads be discussed quite thoroughly with local agencies and other Federal agencies concerned and, if possible, savings be made in the amount of money financed by the Department of Defense?

Admiral PELTIER. All these roads are part of a study generally conducted by the Bureau of Public Roads. There is a continual liaison.

Mr. SIKES. Do they make an effort, as recommended by this committee, to enlist partial financing by the local agencies which are to benefit by the presence of the road, or is an effort made to secure the financial cooperation of the Bureau of Public Roads itself?

Admiral PELTIER. I have maps showing most of these roads here. In most cases, Mr. Chairman, the local citizenry do not benefit from this access road. It is for our own benefit, particularly for the Capehart. There are two cases here to which I think that would not apply.

Mr. SIKES. Are you telling me these roads are all on the reservation in most cases?

Admiral PELTIER. No; they are off the reservation, but they are access to our housing sites and are connecting from the housing site which sometimes is adjacent to the military installation but not near the main entrance. We build this road for the Capehart housing to the main road. This is true at Whiting, Meridian, and Brunswick for the Capehart. At Point Arguello, as you know, Camp Cook is a very large installation there. In Florida, as you can see from this map, we have a facility away back in the boondocks here, and there is very little population. So there would be no local support to agitate for the building of this road. You cannot very well ask the local people to contribute to this when it is primarily for our benefit.

(Off the record.)

ADVANCE LAND RENTAL

Mr. SIKES. Under the next item, "Advance land rental, Ryukyu Islands, Okinawa," $2½ million is requested. Please tell us about this.

Admiral CHEW. The advance payment of military construction appropriated funds for long-term rentals of the Okinawa land was authorized last year in section 409 of Public Law 86–149. Following extensive studies and numerous conferences by the United States and Ryukyu Island officials, agreement was reached on the manner of payment for U.S. use of Okinawa land. Under these arrangements

for payment of advance rentals for land to be leased in excess of 5 years, landowners may elect to take their rentals annually or in lump-sum payments covering a period of 10 years. Funds are available from appropriations to the Army for advance payments covering one year. It is estimated that $2,500,000 will be needed to meet the advance rental payments for the fiscal year 1961 to pay owners who elect to accept the lump-sum payments.

Mr. SIKES. What do you anticipate the total Navy obligation under this program will be?

Admiral CHEW. That is the total, sir.

Admiral PELTIER. It is about $9 million in 9 years. This is 27 percent.

Mr. TIENCKEN. The total payment will be something over $8 million. $2½ million is estimated on the basis that 27 percent of the people will want to take advance payments. We could be wrong in our estimate of 27 percent, in which case we would have to come in with something in excess of $8 million.

Mr. SIKES. What are the Navy obligations in the maintenance and operation account for this same purpose?

Admiral CHEW. I would have to provide that for the record.

Mr. SIKES. Will you, please?

(The information requested follows:)

The Navy and Marine Corps have an annual rental bill of approximately $925,000 which would be chargeable to the maintenance and operation account. This annual rental bill will be reduced by the extent of payments made for advanced rentals from the "Military construction" appropriation. The total rent bill for the 9 years will be approximately $8,350,000. The request for this year's appropriation is for approximately 27 percent of this amount.

PLANNING AND DESIGN

Mr. SIKES. If we may now, we shall take up planning and design, for which $9½ million is requested. I would like to have your comments on this requirement.

Admiral CHEW. These funds are to be used to defray the cost of preliminary engineering of line items proposed for inclusion in the military construction program. Availability of this information allows the Navy to submit to the Congress a program which is soundly engineered and with accurate cost estimates.

These funds are also used for preparation of the final construction plans and specifications for each line item in the program.

Mr. SIKES. How does this amount compare to the last 2 fiscal years?

Admiral CHEW. Last year we had $10 million, and I think the year before $15 million.

Commander BARTLETT. $13,500,000 for fiscal year 1960; $15,400,000 for fiscal year 1959.

Admiral PELTIER. Our requirements this year are actually $13.7 million, but we do have a carryover.

Mr. SIKES. What is the carryover?

Admiral PELTIER. $42. million.

Mr. SIKES. From prior years?

Admiral PELTIER. Yes, sir. We need that to start our final plans and specifications in June and July before we get the apportionment of the next money.

(Off the record.)

TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1960.

NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION, MERIDIAN, MISS.

WITNESSES

REAR ADM. H. A. RENKEN, DIRECTOR, SHORE ESTABLISHMENT DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE DIVISION
REAR ADM. EUGENE J. PELTIER (CEC), USN, CHIEF, BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS
VICE ADM. ROBERT GOLDTHWAITE, CHIEF, NAVAL AIR TRAINING
CAPT. H. C. BRIDGERS, HEAD, AVIATION BASE REQUIREMENT BRANCH, AVIATION PLANS DIVISION, CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS
COMDR. JAMES V. BARTLETT (CEC), USN, DIRECTOR, PROGRAM MANAGEMENT STAFF, BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS
WILFRED P. TIENCKEN, SENIOR REAL ESTATE CONSULTANT, BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS
M. R. HANABURY, DIRECTOR, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION DIVISION, BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS

Mr. SHEPPARD. We are calling this hearing to discuss a couple of items in which the Navy is interested. We shall start with the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Miss.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY | FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM | DATE: 17 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION	MERIDIAN, MISSISSIPPI	-

4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 10,000) Distance & Direction	5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY	6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA
MERIDIAN, 14 MILES SOUTHWEST	LAUDERDALE - KEMPER	BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS	6TH NAVAL DISTRICT

8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	10. STATUS
BASIC FLIGHT TRAINING	1961	☐ MAINTENANCE ☐ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☒ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To maintain and operate facilities and provide service and material to support operations of aviation activities and units of the Naval Air Training Command and other activities and units as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations.

Major Activities Supported:
(1) Basic Training Units as designated

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	-	-	-	-	-	-
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	-	-	-	-	-	-
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1962	200	1,340	288	260*	0	2,088

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	PLANNED	ULTIMATE
	0	0	133

*180 OFFICERS, 80 CADETS

SECTION IV. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS ($)
1. OWNED	8,032**	-	-	0
2. LEASED	-	(-)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		0
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				42,615,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				2,766,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				296,000
**NOT IN INVENTORY ON 1 JULY 1959			7. GRAND TOTAL	45,677,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)				
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
126	LIQUID OXYGEN TRANSFER BUILDING	SF	0	884	0	884	45	0	45	45	112
134	OPTICAL LANDING SYSTEM	EA	0	2	0	2	119	0	119	119	116
141	COMBINED FIRE AND CRASH STATION	SF	0	9,200	0	9,200	170	0	170	170	110
141	PHOTOGRAPHIC LABORATORY	SF	0	4,720	0	4,720	53	0	53	53	115
211	AIRCRAFT POWER CHECK FACILITY	SY	0	1,125	0	1,125	85	0	85	85	109

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA
DAVDOCKS 2570 (7-58) Supersedes DavDocs 4080

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 18

607

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE 17 FEBRUARY 1960
INSTALLATION NAME: NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION	LOCATION: MERIDIAN, MISSISSIPPI	INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.: -

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (Continued)

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY				AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)				
NAVY CODE (1)	LINE ITEM TITLE (2)	UNIT (3)	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959 (4)	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED (5)	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 (6)	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED (7)	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES (8)	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959 (9)	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED (10)	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED (11)	
214	AUTOMOTIVE VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY	SF	0	7,370	0	7,370	204	0	204	204	111
422	MAGAZINES AND READY AMMUNITION LOCKERS	SF	0	424	0	424	28	0	28	28	113
730	BRIG	SF	0	2,640	0	2,640	75	0	75	75	133
730	GATEHOUSE	SF	0	2,800	0	2,800	75	0	75	75	134
740	THEATER	SF	0	6,500	0	6,500	187	0	187	187	135
740	COMMISSIONED OFFICERS' MESS (OPEN)	SF	0	6,500	0	6,500	367	0	367	367	138
740	ENLISTED MEN'S CLUB	SF	0	11,650	0	11,650	279	0	279	279	136
740	CHIEF PETTY OFFICERS' MESS (OPEN)	SF	0	3,000	0	3,000	104	0	104	104	137
740	COMMUNITY CENTER	SF	0	38,220	0	38,220	890	0	890	890	132
750	ENLISTED MEN'S SWIMMING POOL	SF	0	14,150	14,150	0	169	169	0	169	139
851	CRASH SERVICE ROAD	SY	0	52,000	0	52,000	85	0	85	85	114
							TOTAL		2,766	2,935	

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA (Continued)

DD FORM 2570A (7-68) Supersedes Navdocks 6080a

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 18 (Cont'd)

608

Preliminary Engineering Information

LIQUID OXYGEN TRANSFER BUILDING

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Turner and Connell Associates, Jackson, Miss., and is complete at a fee of $1,282.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by the District Public Works Officer, 6th Naval District.

OPTICAL LANDING SYSTEM

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by District Public Works Officer, 6th Naval District, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by the District Public Works Officer, 6th Naval District.

COMBINED FIRE AND CRASH STATION

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by District Public Works Officer, 6th Naval District, and is complete.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and the selection of an architect and engineer is in process.

PHOTOGRAPHIC LABORATORY

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Turner and Connell Associates, Jackson, Miss., and is complete at a fee of $1,975.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by Overstreet, Ware & Ware, Jackson, Miss., at a fee of $5,323.

AIRCRAFT POWER CHECK FACILITY

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Turner and Connell Associates, Jackson, Miss., and is complete at a fee of $1,538.

When final plans and specifications are authorized the District Public Works Officer, 6th Naval District will proceed with selection of an architect and engineer.

AUTOMOTIVE VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Turner and Connell Associates, Jackson, Miss., and is complete at a fee of $2,970.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by the same firm, however, no report of fee has been received.

MAGAZINES AND READY AMMUNITION LOCKERS

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Turner and Connell Associates, Jackson, Miss., and is complete at a fee of $1,080.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by Overstreet, Ware & Ware, Jackson, Miss., at a fee of $1,240.

BRIG

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Turner and Connell Associates, Jackson, Miss., and is complete at a fee of $1,465.

When the final plans and specifications are authorized the District Public Works Officer, 6th Naval District will instruct the same firm to proceed with this work.

GATEHOUSE

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Turner and Connell Associates, Jackson, Miss., and is complete at a fee of $2,506.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by the same firm, however, no report of fee has been received.

THEATER

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Turner and Connell Associates, Jackson, Miss., and is complete at a fee of $2,290.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by the same firm, however no report of fee has been received.

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS' MESS (OPEN)

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Turner and Connell Associates, Jackson, Miss., and is complete at a fee of $4,350.

When final plans and specifications are authorized the District Public Works Officer, 6th Naval District will instruct the same firm to proceed with this work and a fee will be negotiated.

ENLISTED MEN'S CLUB

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Turner and Connell Associates, Jackson, Miss., and is complete at a fee of $2,660.

When final plans and specifications are authorized the District Public Works Officer, 6th Naval District will instruct the same firm to proceed with this work and a fee will be negotiated.

CHIEF PETTY OFFICERS' MESS (OPEN)

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Turner and Connell Associates, Jackson, Miss., and is complete at a fee of $2,380.

When final plans and specifications are authorized the District Public Works Officer, 6th Naval District will instruct the same firm to proceed with this work and a fee will be negotiated.

COMMUNITY CENTER

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Turner and Connell Associates, Jackson, Miss., and is complete at a fee of $6,696.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by the same firm, however no report of fee has been received.

ENLISTED MEN'S SWIMMING POOL

The final plans and specifications for this item were prepared by Turner and Connel, Jackson, Miss., and are complete at a fee of $13,275.

CRASH SERVICE ROAD

The preliminary engineering report for this item was prepared by Turner and Connell Associates, Jackson, Miss., and is complete at a fee of $2,307.

The final plans and specifications have been authorized and are being completed by Overstreet, Ware & Ware, Jackson, Miss., at a fee of $4,410.

PRESENT STATUS OF CONSTRUCTION

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the present status of construction on this base?

Admiral PELTIER. Mr. Chairman, we have obligated as of today $31,535,000, and we expect to obligate by the end of fiscal year $33,256,972.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much do you have in place at this time?

Admiral PELTIER. The accrued cost to date is $20 million. We are placing work at the rate of about $800,000 a month. It is a very steady expenditure.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the fiscal year 1961 program complete the construction at Meridian?

Admiral RENKEN. All except about two minor projects, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When you say "minor," what do you mean as far as money is concerned?

Captain BRIDGERS. $327,000 total, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the status of the outlying field and what are your plans for more than one of these fields?

Captain BRIDGERS. We shall have only one outlying field, Mr. Chairman, outlying field Bravo. We will not need two for the load we will have at Meridian.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will this outlying field provide the two runways you have stated are absolutely required?

Captain BRIDGERS. The outlying field will have just one runway, sir. We have a cross-wind runway only at the parent station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There is no contemplation of extending that field further for the requirements foreseeable at the moment by an additional runway?

Captain BRIDGERS. There are none, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What will be the total cost of the outlying field and your obligations on that particular project as of this date or the nearest date you can give to us?

Admiral PELTIER. Outlying field Bravo is under contract. As of April of this month we awarded the contract.

Mr. SIKES. You have just awarded the contract, and no work has been done on it?

Admiral PELTIER. Practically none. I think they are moving their equipment in.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What consideration was given to the Demopolis site before purchasing the land at Bravo? Was it pretty fairly shaken down or not?

Captain BRIDGERS. Yes, sir. It was thoroughly investigated along with some other sites, Mr. Chairman. The airspace, especially insofar as civil airways are concerned, was not good at Demopolis.

CHANGES IN BASE LOADING

Mr. SHEPPARD. How are you going to handle aircraft carrier qualification training in Meridian? What is the process there, if you know, gentlemen?

Captain BRIDGERS. We will conduct the preliminary phases of carrier landing training at this station. The final phases and the actual carrier qualification will be done from Pensacola.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Recalling your previous testimony, what is the reason for decreasing the number of planes from 203 last year to 133 now? How firm do you figure the number 133 to be?

Captain BRIDGERS. The number 133 is quite firm, sir. They are planes actually in possession of the Chief of Naval Air Training or those which have been manufactured and will shortly be delivered to him.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What operational condition has prevailed which caused the reduction from 203 to 133?

Captain BRIDGERS. Generally, sir, the reduction was one of financial limitations, the inability to buy the contemplated number of basic jet trainers.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that indicative that with additional funding, if and when you may get it, you will go back to the figure 203?

Captain BRIDGERS. That is a possibility, Mr. Chairman, but I think it is quite remote. If we did attain additional aircraft, I think no doubt some of them would be put in Meridian and the rest would be put in to Whiting Field or Pensacola.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, in the future, so far as your basic planning at present, if you find eventually you can go to 203, does that mean you will have to have more construction expenditure in order to absorb the difference between 133 and 203?

Captain BRIDGERS. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I note also a population reduction of over 500, including a student reduction of about 30 percent in the last year. What is the reason for that? How firm is the present base loading?

Captain BRIDGERS. The reduction is personnel, sir, is commensurate with the reduction in the numbers of aircraft assigned to the station. Both the aircraft figures and the personnel figures, within minor percentages, are quite firm.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does that indicate that in case you go back to the figure of 203, you will increase the personnel from its present figure up to its original amount?

Captain BRIDGERS. The same answer applies, Mr. Chairman. I do not think we would increase Meridian to the original figure of 203 aircraft.

Mr. SHEPPARD. With the curtailment of the mission at Meridian from that originally planned, do you have any facilities now constructed or under construction which will not be fully utilized?

Captain BRIDGERS. We have no facilities under construction or available to us for basic jet training which are not being used.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When your construction is completed, what will be the answer then?

Admiral PELTIER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to elaborate on that just a little bit. We do have the foundations and first floor slab in for the cadet barracks. One wing is being cut back. We have some foundations in for the supply warehouse which is being cut back. I gather that was the intent of your question.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is correct.

The cutback now is indicative, I assume, of the fact that you may later come in and ask for more funds in order to pick up this cutback, is that correct?

Admiral PELTIER. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is not intended?

Admiral PELTIER. That is not intended.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Had you already expended funds in that area or had you been able to anticipate the cutback in order to avoid expenditure?

Admiral PELTIER. Mr. Chairman, we had started the supply warehouse and the foundations were in.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much did you spend on it?

Admiral PELTIER. There will be some expenditure. I do not have those figures available. Of course, when you cut back a construction job in progress, you never get back all your money. There are materials on hand and things like that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much of a premium did you pay for cutting back on your contract?

Admiral PELTIER. I would not say we paid a premium. We negotiated a change order.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I use the term loosely. In other words, I assume you started the contract in good faith. You issued a contract for a certain amount of construction. Then you had to cut it back.

Admiral PELTIER. We did. The final negotiation is not complete because one of the things we most determine is how much of the material he has purchased he is able to use in this or a subsequent project. That will be one of the items which will affect the negotiation of how much reduction we will get out of it. There will be a deductive change order for work not accomplished. I would say if we got 40 percent back we would do very well.

NEED FOR OFFICERS CLUB SWIMMING POOL

Mr. SHEPPARD. Gentlemen, why do you need a swimming pool and bathhouse for the officer's club here funded from appropriated funds? What is that requirements based on in its funding category that I have just expressed?

Captain BRIDGERS. The purpose of the pool, Mr. Chairman, is to provide receational factilities for the officers and their dependents stationed at Meridian. It was put in the military construction program rather than trying to obtain it from nonappropriated funds because the demand on the nonappropriated funds is quite heavy, and it seemed that this was a proper item to put in this program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that the usual procedure, gentlemen, or rather the exception to the rule?

Captain BRIDGERS. It is the usual procedure for new stations such as this and Lemoore, sir. For old stations, it is the usual procedure to try to obtain such facilities through nonappropriated funds.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How did you fund the swimming pool built within the past several years at Whiting?

Mr. HANABURY. We shall have to supply that for the record. I do not know, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

A 25- by 50-foot pool for commissioned officers was built at NAAS Whiting Field in 1955. This pool was built with nonappropriated funds at a cost of $13,800.

FAMILY HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT

Mr. SHEPPARD. How many family houses do you have at this station? Also, what is in the 1961 program?

Admiral PELTIER. The Capehart housing program is in the 1960 program, Mr. Chairman. We have taken bids on this project and we are now in process of trying to close it. The number of units is 320.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have you any Wherry projects involved?

Admiral PELTIER. Not at this station.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What do you contemplate in the so-called community center?

Admiral RENKEN. Mr. Chairman, this facility will provide a number of the community support features usually found in a small shopping center. These include a commissary, Navy exchange, cafeteria, gymnasium and bowling alleys, special services office and supply room, gameroom, library, post office, and automobile parking area. The military personnel to be assigned to the station and the dependents of the married uniformed personnel will number approximately 3,800. With Meridian being about 14 miles away from the station, it is considered essential to provide a community of this size with these normal living accommodations.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the total population you will have to accommodate there?

Admiral RENKEN. Captain Bridgers, can you supply that? Thirty-eight hundred is the best estimate at this time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That includes military and civilian equally, is that it?

Admiral RENKEN. Excluding civilians. That is dependents of married uniformed personnel, 3800. There are 288 civilians.

Mr. SHEPPARD. With all of the clubs on this rather small base, why do you need another cafeteria here?

Mr. HANABURY. Mr. Chairman, normally we like to have a so-called cafeteria in the ships service or community center for the benefit of enlisted men who cannot make regular hours in the messhall and things of that nature—for instance, a hamburger after the movies, and things of that nature, something that we normally provide. It is allowed under the Department of Defense recreation criteria.

Mr. SHEPPARD. My friend, it is one thing to like these things, and it is another thing to have an established requirement. I can understand your phraseology, and I do not think the word "like" is quite what you meant there. Either you have a necessity for it or you do not. Just to feed somebody a few hamburgers does not justify this type of expenditure as such.

Mr. HANABURY. Experience over the years, Mr. Chairman, has proven a requirement for it, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is to be a cafeteria in its completeness, is that it?

Mr. HANABURY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Open how many hours a day and to serve how many people potentially?

Mr. HANABURY. Potentially, probably in the neighborhood of 300 or 400, sir. The number of seats I think is probably 60 or 70.

Admiral PELTIER. One hundred thirty-two.

EFFECT OF STOPPING CONSTRUCTION AT MERIDIAN

Mr. SHEPPARD. If construction at Meridian were stopped now, what, in your estimation, would be the settlement costs?

Admiral PELTIER. Mr. Chairman, we have made an estimate of this. We worked on the basis of stopping at June 30, when we will have obligated about $33 million. We feel that we could make a $5 million savings in this amount.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right. What actual and definite curtailment operationally would it mean if it were stopped? You have talked about the money. What would it mean in operational requirements that you could not utilize at some other base by distribution or manipulation within the operational resorces?

Captain BRIDGERS. It would mean that we would have to continue, sir, the makeshift arrangement we are now using of a portion of the training conducted at Forrest Sherman Field where the airspace and other tenants make these operations very undesirable, and at South Kingsville where the condition of the field and the combined operation of basic jet training with advanced jet training are quite undesirable. We would have either to continue that or to develop some other field in order to handle the load.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, geographically speaking and within the complement of the Navy's operational requirement—I mean complement of the general area now—do you feel you would be up against an operational requirement which was insurmountable? Is that correct?

Captain BRIDGERS. That is my opinion, sir. Perhaps Admiral Goldthwaite, the Chief of Naval Air Training, would like to comment on this.

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. Mr. Chairman, I would hesitate to say it was insurmountable. We certainly could get along with the situation which would result from this, but we would have one which I would consider to be extremely difficult. We have overloaded our airfields throughout the training command historically.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does that go for Pensacola, Fla.?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. Yes, sir. Right this minute, in my opinion, we are getting along with an undesirable situation as far as Sherman Field.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on the item? The gentleman on my right.

NAVAL AIR TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to acknowledge the presence here of Adm. Robert Goldthwaite, Chief of the Naval Air Training Command at Pensacola. I feel he has an outstanding organization and provides great leadership for that organization.

It might be well for our purpose, Mr. Chairman, if we could get a broader look at the entire training program, and I suggest that the witnesses here tell us what facilities are available and what the training program is at each. This of course will have to be brief. I do not want to take too long with it. I know we have other things we must do. If we could have someone run speedily through the training program at each of the installations in this complex and tell us the length of time of the course, the number of people accommodated, how students progress from one to the other, so we could get a broader picture initially, it would help us to understand what is involved here. May we have that?

Captain BRIDGERS. Mr. Chairman, that is quite a broad order to do briefly. I shall be glad to undertake it.

Mr. SIKES. I would like to suggest that you run through it quite briefly with us, but that you expand your answer for the record so the record does show a complete picture. Initially, you can tell in a few words what is done at each base, how long the training program is, and how that program is expected to vary. No doubt you have charts.

(The following was submitted later:)

THE NAVAL AIR TRAINING COMMAND

The Naval Air Training Command produces naval aviators for the fleets capable of obtaining the maximum from weapons and weapon systems.

The present flight training syllabus is 18 months in length. The annual program output is 1,800 Navy—Marine, and 100 Coast Guard and foreign pilots. Primary and basic pilot training is accomplished in the Pensacola, Fla. area. Advanced training is conducted in the Corpus Christi, Tex. area. Upon completion of advanced training, newly designated aviators report to the fleet for further training in operation type aircraft prior to assignment to fleet squadrons.

In the training cycle, the student pilot reports for basic training at Pensacola. First, he goes to the preflight school. There he receives academic instruction in aviation and related subjects, including military drills and physical conditioning. For nonofficer students this school is 16 weeks in length. For officer students the course is 10 weeks. About 700 flight students are normally handled at this unit.

On completing preflight, a student goes to primary flight training at Saufley Field. Here he learns to solo, and is taught spins, stalls, precision landings and aerobatics. This phase takes 7 weeks and the normal student load is about 460.

On completing primary, the student enters basic training at Whiting Field. Here he receives air tactics—which includes formation, night and cross-country flying, the fundamentals of fixed air gunnery and glide bombing. This take 15 weeks. Normal student load is about 710.

The next phase of basic training is at Saufley Field. Here the student learns the technique of carrier landing, and makes 6 landings on board a carrier in trainer aircraft. This phase takes 3 weeks. Normal student load is about 80 students.

As an interim measure and until basic jet facilities at Meridian are completed, some students destined for jet training receive a similar basic syllabus in basic jet aircraft at Forrest Sherman Field. This unit has a normal load of about 180 students.

After completing basic, the student goes to the Advanced Training Command. This training, however, is in a specialized type of flying. These flight specialties are: Jet carrier, prop carrier, carrier ASW, and patrol ASW.

(Additional information was supplied to the Committee.)

The jet carrier student receives advanced instrument training in the F9F–8T two-place jet trainer at NAAS Kingsville or NAAS Chase Field, followed by tactics, aerobatics, formation night flying and navigation. This takes 18 weeks, and each of these fields supports about 205 students. For the final phase, the student flies the F11F supersonic Grumman jet fighter. This is a 5-week course and includes tactics, air weapons, night, instrument and formation flying.

The prop carrier student receives advanced instrument training at NAS Corpus Christi in the AD–5 two-place attack aircraft followed by Formation, Tactics, gunnery, navigation and nite flying and carrier qualification in the AD–6 single-place version. This is a 20-week course and the normal student load is about 70.

The carrier ASW student receives his advanced training at NAAS New Iberia, in the S2F Grumman Tracker. All stages of training, including carrier qualification, are conducted in this unit over a 21-week period. The normal student load is about 90.

The patrol ASW student receives advanced training at NAS Corpus Christi in the SNB, S2F, P2V and R4D type aircraft. The three phases of training include instrument, cross-country navigation, airways navigation, night flying and celestial navigation. The course length is 24 weeks, and the normal student load is about 284.

On completion of the advanced phase of training, the student is designated a naval aviator and is sent to the fleet for training in operational types.

Captain BRIDGERS. Yes, I do. I think it would assist the members who are not as familiar with the area as you are.

The Training Command is divided into three separate organizations. Admiral Goldthwaite is the Chief of Naval Air Training, and he has under his command the Technical Training Command located at Memphis, also with part of its activities at Glynco. He has the Basic Training Command centered in the Pensacola area, of which Meridian will be a part. He has the Advanced Training Command centered in the Corpus Christi area, and he also has the Naval Air Reserve Training Command which is not part of this problem, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Where are Kingsville and New Iberia in this picture? Will you touch on those?

Captain BRIDGERS. Yes, sir, I thought I would.

The student comes initially to Pensacola, the main station here. He goes through preflight training, during which time he does not fly. When he has completed his preflight training he goes to Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Saufley Field, which is located here. Upon completion of this primary instruction at Saufley, he goes then to Whiting Field. This is the basic training area. At the present time we are conducting the propeller basic training at Whiting. The jet portion of the basic training is conducted partially at Forrest Sherman Field in Pensacola. That is the main O. & R. field and service field for the entire Pensacola area. The rest of the basic jet training is in the process of being taken from Memphis, where it has been conducted, to a portion of Kingsville in Texas known as South Kingsville. The reason for this move is the fact that at Memphis there is no outlying field. Therefore, the student while he is at Memphis cannot do any flying himself. Only the instrument phase of basic jet training is conducted there.

So we have at this point two operations: basic propeller and basic jet.

When the student finishes his basic training, he goes to the Corpus Christi area. The fields here are Corpus Christi itself, Kingsville, Chase, and New Iberia. At Kingsville and Chase, advanced jet training is conducted. At Corpus Christi itself, propeller attack is taught, and at New Iberia propeller antisubmarine warfare training is taught.

In the case of Meridian, we are trying to concentrate all of the basic jet training at the Meridian station with the exception of the carrier qualification portion, which will continue to be done at Pensacola.

Mr. SIKES. Tell us for the record what is done at Brewton?

Captain BRIDGERS. Brewton is an outlying field to Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting, and touch-and-go landings are conducted there.

Mr. SIKES. What do you plan to do with Memphis?

Captain BRIDGERS. Memphis will continue as the headquarters and the major portion of technical training.

Mr. SIKES. What kind of training will be done there?

Captain BRIDGERS. All technical training, which comprises essentially two different types, Mr. Sikes. One is mechanic- and maintenance-type training. The other is specialist training, like aerology and radar.

Mr. SIKES. Do you have all the facilities there you need for that purpose, or will you have to come back for additional facilities?

Captain BRIDGERS. We need to put new facilities in Memphis, Mr. Sikes.

Mr. SIKES. Why do you move activities to Memphis if you have to build additional facilities there?

Captain BRIDGERS. We are not able at this time to move them there, sir. Some of them are located now at Jacksonville.

Mr. SIKES. Why do you want to move them if there are facilities at Jacksonville or elsewhere which will do the job and if you will have to put new facilities at Memphis to take care of it?

Captain BRIDGERS. In order to consolidate the training in one place, sir. The facilities at Jacksonville are usable. The ones at Memphis need to be reworked. In order to consolidate technical training at Memphis, we do need some new facilities.

Mr. SIKES. What will you do with the facilities at Jacksonville which you vacate if you build new facilities at Memphis to provide for the consolidation?

Captain BRIDGERS. The facilities which would be vacated in Jacksonville are a minor portion of a large industrial-type station, and they would be used for other purposes than training.

Mr. SIKES. Would you consolidate facilities at Memphis if there is no additional construction available there, or do you propose to complete the consolidation and then ask for the additional facilities?

Captain BRIDGERS. We cannot consolidate the bulk of the technical training at Memphis until new facilities are provided.

Mr. SIKES. Do you propose to move all flight training out of Memphis?

Captain BRIDGERS. All flight training, yes, sir, if you except the Naval Reserve training.

Mr. SIKES. Is the reason for moving flight training due to the fact that there is no outlying field?

Captain BRIDGERS. That is not the entire reason, sir. It is also partially in order to lighten the load at Memphis to make more space available for technical training.

Mr. SIKES. You would like to consolidate technical training in one place.

Captain BRIDGERS. The bulk of it, yes, sir. We will have to continue a substantial portion of it at Glynco and some small pieces of it at various places around the country, but the object is to consolidate the bulk of the technical training a Memphis.

Mr. SIKES. Have you an estimate of the amount of cost involved in consolidating that training at Memphis in the way of new facilities?

Captain BRIDGERS. We have conducted various studies, Mr. Sikes. I think the simplest answer I could give to your question would be in the neighborhood of $6 million, sir.

Mr. SIKES. That would be the safe minimum?

Captain BRIDGERS. Yes, sir.

NAS, NEW IBERIA, LA.

Mr. SIKES. Let us talk about New Iberia.

Captain BRIDGERS. It is a good station.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SIKES. Is this not a very small operation for a station which cost you $25 million?

Captain BRIDGERS. If you look at it from the cost standpoint, Mr. Sikes, I think one cannot help but agree with you.

Mr. SIKES. Could not that ASW work have been carried on just as well at some of the existing facilities?

Captain BRIDGERS. Not as well, no, sir.

Mr. SIKES. But it could have been carried on at some of the existing facilities.

Captain BRIDGERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. What did you originally plan to use New Iberia for?

Captain BRIDGERS. Originally, New Iberia and Meridian were to be new fields for advanced training. At that time we had a projected training rate of 3,300, and we wanted to give our pilots in advanced training 150 hours.

Mr. SIKES. I have heard that New Iberia is really not suited for that purpose.

Captain BRIDGERS. It is not, sir, the way it was built. It was suited originally as planned. Remember, New Iberia was cut back substantially.

Mr. SIKES. At the time New Iberia and Meridian were programmed, you also planned a facility at Brewton, did you not?

Captain BRIDGERS. In that neighborhood, yes.

Mr. SIKES. As a result of the cutback which it was necessary to schedule shortly afterwards, you canceled plans for Brewton, is that true?

Captain BRIDGERS. That is true.

Mr. SIKES. The plans for New Iberia and Meridian were too far advanced; you were in the midst of construction, and the reduction in the number of pilots which is now known to us was not fully apparent at that time, is that true?

Captain BRIDGERS. It was not apparent at that time, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Knowing what we know now, you probably would not have built New Iberia and possibly you would not have built Meridian, but the fact is that you now have Meridian nearly complete and New Iberia already commissioned. Is that right?

Captain BRIDGERS. I do not think that is exactly right, Mr. Sikes. In a sense that is true. Please understand, sir. We are talking now about a hindsight of 5 years and a foresight of 3 years.

Mr. SIKES. I do not censure the Navy for this situation. You were proceeding in good faith. The Navy thought it would need the pilots these facilities would provide. The Navy then was planning an all jet force. It takes a lot of space for them. Jet training is a bigger operation than all-prop training. The situation which has resulted is the result of the development of missiles, and changes the resulting charges in the pilot training program, in the defense picture generally which none of us could foresee. So I am not criticizing you. I think, however, it is helpful that we understand exactly how this situation came about. Will you please proceed.

Captain BRIDGERS. I think that is a very fair summation of the problem, sir. I think we have endeavored to keep up with our changes in training requirements. We are making good use of New Iberia. We do definitely need Meridian, sir, even under the present conditions.

Mr. SIKES. Is no use contemplated for New Iberia except a small ASW operation?

Captain BRIDGERS. There is no other activity planned for that station, sir.

Mr. SIKES. How large could that operation be if ASW activities were expanded? Would they be expanded at New Iberia, or would the additional ASW work be conducted elsewhere?

Captain BRIDGERS. May I answer the question and then defer to Admiral Goldthwaite. My opinion is if ASW operations were expanded substantially, the initial expansion would take place at New Iberia because, while it was designed for its current load, there is emergency expansion capability there. If there were an increase of great order of magnitude, I am sure we would have to go to other stations.

Mr. SIKES. You will have how many ASW planes at New Iberia?

Captain BRIDGERS. A total of 50 planes.

Mr. SIKES. How much could you expand it without expanding the facilities?

Captain BRIDGERS. I would estimate 25 planes and the equivalent personnel.

Mr. SIKES. So it is operating at about two-thirds of what you would consider a comfortable maximum?

Captain BRIDGERS. No, sir. It is operating at design capacity.

Mr. SIKES. It is now operating at design capacity?

Captain BRIDGERS. Yes, sir. It was designed for a load of 50 airplanes.

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. May I add that the limiting factor in New Iberia is parking space, concrete parking space.

Mr. SIKES. That is a relatively inexpensive item.

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. That would be relatively inexpensive to expand.

Mr. SIKES. When was it decided to use New Iberia for ASW purposes?

Captain BRIDGERS. About 1957.

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. I can tell you almost exactly. It was in November of 1957.

Mr. SIKES. What is the situation with regard to Corpus Christi? You stopped O. & R. activities at Corpus Christi a year ago. What is planned in the future for Corpus Christi?

Captain BRIDGERS. I see no change in the future for Corpus Christi different from that which exists today, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Will the training load be about the same?

Captain BRIDGERS. Yes, sir.

EFFECT OF REDUCTION IN PILOT TRAINING LOAD

Mr. SIKES. What is the situation now in pilot training? Have we now reached a level-off in numbers, or do you foresee, Admiral Goldthwaite, further reductions?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. I, of course, am not in the seat that would make that decision. Based upon the 7,200 operating aircraft that the Navy has continuously insisted is its requirement, 1,900 is the level that we should remain at. That is the level.

Mr. SIKES. That is the current level?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. Yes, sir. That is the planned level at the present time.

I would like to add, if I might, to the record so far as Pensacola and Memphis are concerned. There are many other activities at Pensacola, as you know. One of them is the photographic school, which trains not only on the ground but in the air. So there are jet aircraft there which are not in the pilot training program. The Blue Angels are also based there. There are some 40 operational airplanes at Forrest Sherman Field, Pensacola, which are not included in any of our so-called pilot training program base loading. It paints an entirely different picture of the field when you attempt to operate a field for more than one purpose or more than one type of airplane, particularly when students are flying the jets or prop airplanes for the first time.

At Memphis, we plan to consolidate as much as we can of the technical training there. You may remember that we closed Norman, Okla., which was a big school, and moved the population into Memphis. This made Memphis burst at the seams actually. They are greatly overcrowded in temporary barracks. At one time they did not have even siding in the interior. You could see the studs in the barracks. In past years we have built several very fine, modern buildings there as it had always been planned that Memphis would be the center of all of our technical training to the extent that we could economically do so.

At Jacksonville we have a school which has a large quantity of very expensive electronic equipment, situated in a temporary building. All of those buildings in the technical training unit at Jacksonville are temporary buildings. It was our desire and we believe it to be the most economical and timesaving and equipment-saving to move this expensive equipment into a new wing of a building which we have already built there, putting another wing on that building.

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. This is why we do not want to put any type of pilot training at Memphis in addition to the fact that this does not have an outlying field.

(Additional off the record testimony.)

Mr. SIKES. Where was the ASW now at New Iberia originally scheduled for?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. In Kingsville. Now, we have jets and basic jets there temporarily.

Mr. SIKES. From what station did the jets move which are now at Kingsville?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. We moved down from Memphis. They are still moving actually.

Mr. SIKES. Some of those at Kingsville will go to Meridan?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. What will happen to Kingsville when Meridian is operational?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. It will be an advanced jet training base with about 149 advanced jets of the F–9-, F–8-, and F–11-type aircraft.

Mr. SIKES. How many are there now?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. That same number.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SIKES. What is the situation with regard to Chase?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. The same situation at Chase except that we do not have basic jets there. We have about the same number of advanced jets at Chase.

Mr. SIKES. Will the planes that are to go to Meridan come then from Kingsville and from Forrest Sherman?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. That is correct; very few from Forrest Sherman, relatively few.

Mr. SIKES. The number that is forecasted is about 65; is that correct?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. That is correct.

Mr. SIKES. Leaving about 35 for basic training at Forrest Sherman?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. Thirty-five basic jets at Forrest Sherman. In addition to the other activities, making about 120 total.

OVERHAUL AND REPAIR FACILITIES

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. Now, there is another governing factor about Pensacola. As you know, it is an O. & R. industrial area and O. & R. today operates from a field which is called Chevalier Field, and which was the old field that I trained on back in 1927. It should be closed right now for safety's sake, but we do not have space for them up at Forrest Sherman and eventually I want to move all of the O. & R. airplanes that are being readied and tested. Of course, we receive all of the airplanes through Forrest Sherman and move them up there on the field which will again take up capacity, but might not fully utilize the runways for bouncing.

Mr. SIKES. For the record, Where is the O. & R. work now done for the Naval Air Training Command?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. At Pensacola.

Mr. SIKES. Is there not a need for an improvement in O. & R. facilities for the Naval Air Training Command?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. I would say that the Navy's total overhaul and repair picture is the governing factor, not what is in the training command.

Mr. SIKES. Are not the facilities that are available now old and scattered?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. The facilities are scattered and some are very old and some are relatively new, having been built since 1940.

POSSIBLE CLOSING AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Mr. SIKES. To get back to the complex, are any closures contemplated in the area as a result of the general changes we have discussed?

Specifically, I refer to the opening of Meridian; are any closures actually contemplated?

Captain BRIDGERS. No, sir.

Mr. SIKES. If the pilot training load were further decreased, let us say 10 percent, what would be the effect on the operations of the bases in this complex? Would there then be closures?

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SIKES. If it were reduced 25 percent would there then be closures?

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SIKES. Where? What is the projected closure list if closures are contemplated or become necessary? What goes first?

(Off the record.)

OUTLYING FIELDS IN MERIDIAN AND IN PENSACOLA AREA

Mr. SIKES. You have discussed the outlying fields. Can you operate Meridian with one outlying field?

Captain BRIDGERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Satisfactorily?

Captain BRIDGERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. On this outlying field which has been just contracted, no work has been done other than moving in some equipment. You testified previously that there are no satisfactory alternatives to the construction of an outlying field. Are you still convinced of that?

Captain BRIDGERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Are outlying fields required anywhere else in this complex that are not now operational?

Captain BRIDGERS. No, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Do you have a requirement for an outlying field at Whiting?

Captain BRIDGERS. We feel, Mr. Sikes, that the requirement for two outlying fields at Whiting——

Mr. SIKES. I know you are operating one Air Force auxiliary now and you plan to operate another, or have you started using the second one?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. We have not started that.

Mr. SIKES. When do you plan to start using field one?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. Within the month. We have changed our plans because of the condition of that field and we are going to use it for propeller bounce rather than jet bounce.

Mr. SIKES. You have this field on a year-to-year contract?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. It is a year-to-year joint use contract with the Air Force; Eglin 1 and Eglin 6.

Mr. SIKES. Do you foresee that those two will meet your requirements for outlying fields?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. For the jet. Eglin 6 will meet it alone and it will meet the requirement for jet bounce plus the possible use of some of the fields that are marginal for jet bounce.

I would like to interject a thought here that we have just recently gotten a new airplane, a jet basic trainer, and have had only a small amount of experience with the students in this particular airplane. We are attempting now to evaluate and see if, by more experience, we can use smaller, marginal fields for this purpose.

Mr. SIKES. How long do you think this training will be done at field 1? I did not think that field 1 would be very useful to you because of its proximity to flight patterns at Eglin and because of distance from Whiting.

Do you contemplate that you will use it indefinitely?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. I hope not because it is so far away from even Whiting that it is not efficient to use it.

Mr. SIKES. Do you still feel that there may be a requirement for the Blackwater D or a comparable auxiliary?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. Not as long as we have the availability of Eglin 6 and Eglin 1.

I get back to that because I am not too sure that we can use these marginal fields for jet bounce.

STATUS OF MERIDIAN

Mr. SIKES. As the situation now stands, the Meridian is what percent completed?

Captain BRIDGERS. I think I have some figures that will answer the question fairly well.

In answer to that question, sir, of fiscal year 1957 projects, 91 percent; fiscal 1958 projects, 76 percent; 1959 projects, 12 percent; 1960 projects, 4 percent.

That is a factual answer, sir, and I think that from a feeling standpoint, one might say it is 75 percent complete.

Mr. SIKES. It is almost altogether funded; is that right?

Captain BRIDGERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. What would you have in the way of operational facilities at Meridian as of now without the additional programs contained in the 1961 budget and proposed for the 1962 budget?

Captain BRIDGERS. We would not have the following: An optical landing system which is essential from a flight standpoint. We would not have a combined fire and crash station which is, safetywise, essential. We would not have a photographic building and the purpose of that building is twofold; to develop aerial gunnery film and——

Mr. SIKES. Why do you not complete the list for the record?

Captain BRIDGERS. All right.

(The information supplied follows:)

NAAS MERIDIAN, MISS.

Fiscal year 1961 MCON:
- Optical landing system
- Aircraft fire and crash station
- Photographic building
- Liquid-oxygen transfer building
- Aircraft power check facility
- Automotive vehicle maintenance facility
- Magazines and ready ammunition lockers
- Brig
- Gatehouse
- Commissary and community center
- Theater
- Commissioned officers' mess (open)
- Enlisted men's club
- Chief petty officers' mess (open)
- Crash service road
- Swimming pool

Fiscal year 1962 MCON:
- Chapel
- Outdoor recreation facility

Mr. SIKES. What about housing? Do you have housing?

Captain BRIDGERS. That is correct.

Mr. SIKES. Do you need it?

Captain BRIDGERS. The Capthart housing is in the last year's program——

Mr. SIKES. What is the status of it now?

Captain BRIDGERS. Just about to be contracted.

Admiral PELTIER. Bids have been received.

Mr. SIKES. What is the situation on schools? Do you need to build schools in the area?

Captain BRIDGERS. The Navy does not need to build any schools; no, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Actually you have built a base but it cannot be operational unless the facilities which are now requested are included; is that about right?

Captain BRIDGERS. That is right.

Mr. SIKES. You have already spent how much money on it?

Admiral PELTIER. $20 million, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Is there any other use in the Navy program for the base with the facilities which it now has?

Captain BRIDGERS. It would be completely useless.

AIR CONGESTION IN PENSACOLA AREA

Mr. SIKES. There has been a statement made that the Forrest Sherman facility could be expanded with little difficulty but you would have an airspace problem.

Captain BRIDGERS. I think that this chart may look as though it is trying to be facetious or glamorous, but it is not. You can see that in order to get all of Admiral Goldthwaite's training command on a relatively small section of the country, I had to use a scale such as this. In order to make any sense of the Pensacola area, it had to be blown up in this fashion. I do not know of any military training area, or any training area, that is as heavily congested as the Pensacola area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You say congested. Are you referring to military or a combination of military and civilian?

Captain BRIDGERS. I am referring only to military training, Mr. Chairman, because there are more congested areas of nontraining and commercial airline operation, but there is a great difference between scheduled airline operations and military pilots flying under FAA control, and student aviators.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Using the figure of 100 in your total flying congested situation, what percentage is commercial as against military?

Captain BRIDGERS. In this area?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is right.

Captain BRIDGERS. I would say that if you have 100 military airplanes, the commercial planes would be less than 10.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What amount of time is lost because of air congestion in the area of military operational requirements?

Captain BRIDGERS. Subject to Admiral Goldthwaite's correction, I think no time is lost due to that factor. I think the main problem is that this is dangerous.

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. What he is saying is that due to the congestion of the air, there is serious danger of collision. At one time we were operating 700 airplanes out of 3 fields within about 8 miles. These youngsters, because of the congestion, every time they take off, from the first time they fly and airplane solo, have to proceed on set courses and times for certain altitudes and proceed along that route. They will have to go to some other place to do their training and there is a loss of flight time which I can measure for you if I can go back down to Pensacola.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now, I go back to the question asked: Can you tell me, out of the total operational hazard and time lost, what contribution the commercial airlines add to that of the military? I am trying to get the two straightened out.

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. About 1 percent.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that a small percentage in areas of that type?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you have congestion there, the congestion is military congestion you have created yourselves and nobody else?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. That was created of necessity, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Whether of necessity or not, you can fly the planes elsewhere if you want to?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. We were trying to do that and this is one of the bases upon which the modernization of the Training Command has proceeded in the past.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have been to these bases many times and I know you are right but any time you send pilots up in a hazardous condition in which only 1 percent is contributed to by civilian airplanes, that is your responsibility; is that right or wrong?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you, Mr. Sikes.

SAFETY RECORD IN AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Mr. SIKES. What is your safety situation now? Would you give us your safety record for the past few years?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. My safety record in the training command has come down about——

Mr. SIKES. Improved?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. It has improved from over 7 per 10,000 hours to slightly over 1 per 10,000 hours.

(Additional information follows:)

1. Naval Air Training Command aircraft accident statistics

	Number of major accidents	Accident rate per 10,000 flight hours
July 1, 1959 to Mar. 1, 1960	67	1.4
July 1, 1958 to July 1, 1959	127	1.6
July 1, 1957 to July 1, 1958	191	1.7

The projected improvement in safety which will be realized by conducting basic jet training at Meridian can only be deduced. It cannot be statistically demonstrated by reason that operations in basic jet training aircraft have only recently been instituted. The low accident rate of 1.4 major accidents per

10,000 flight hours in the training command would be difficult to improve upon. However, it is considered reasonable to assume that it will be imminently easier to retain this low rate when basic jet training is conducted from Meridian. Here the training will be all of one type rather than being intermingled with miscellaneous flight activities as it must now be at Forest Sherman and superimposed on high performance advanced jet training as it is at South Kingsville. In the Pensacola area alone there will be about 90 basic jets operating in addition to 745 other aircraft of various types. In order to appreciate the magnitude of the problem in the Pensacola area, we have 835 aircraft operating from 4 major fields with 23 outlying fields all located within a quarter circle whose radius is 46 miles. The removal of 60 basic jet aircraft and all basic jet training except carrier qualification from the Pensacola area to Meridian can only serve to reduce the possibility of fatal accidents. The removal of basic jet operations from South Kingsville can also have only a salutary effect. It is never desirable from a safety standpoint to mix phases of training and here, at Kingsville, we have very inexperienced students flying basic jets separated by only 2 miles from only relatively experienced advanced students flying extremely demanding high performance fleet type jets. Similarity of training operations at Meridian will also contribute to come effective training in that, while retaining high safety standards, course rules and procedures can be less complicated.

During the first 9 months of fiscal year 1960, through March 1960, when the accident rate was 1.4 major accidents per 10,000 flight hours the fatal accident rate was 1 fatality per 52,747 flight hours.

It is impossible to compare the Naval Air Training Command exactly with other similar operations by the other services inasmuch as the geographical layout and numbers of aircraft assigned at the various complexes vary to too large a degree. However, from an overall command standpoint the safety record of the Naval Air Training Command will compare most favorably with any other similar activity.

Mr. SIKES. I think that is a very fine record in view of the congestion that does exist.

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. The airlines do provide a hazard but by judicious routing of our training planes, in what we call channels or tunnels under the airways at certain points, we are able to avoid any serious damage up to now.

AIR SAFETY IN AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Mr. SIKES. May I request, Mr. Chairman, that we be given the projected improvement which is forecast as a result of the changes in mission at the various exchanges, if there are improvements projected in safety, and that the Navy also be requested to supply information on safety rates per capita, and any additional information that will help to show us what the true picture is on safety in the area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you want to see whether this is an average rate of fatality?

Mr. SIKES. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Supply that information, gentlemen.

What is your average takeoff per hour on training?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. We try to load our planes on the basis of one takeoff and one landing per minute.

Mr. SHEPPARD. No further questions.

Thank you.

Captain BRIDGERS. I think, Mr. Sikes, that this chart would be helpful for the reason that it is a result of a recent survey of military flying only. This is drawn up in this fashion so you can see the load Pensacola has. Each one of these [indicating] represents 100 military planes. We have represented here the Jacksonville area, the Mobile area, and the Atlanta area.

DESIRABLE CHANGE IN AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Mr. SIKES. From the standpoint of your experience and knowledge, are there any recommended changes in this picture which you would make to this committee?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. Under the present loading?

Mr. SIKES. Yes.

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. Program 1900?

Mr. SIKES. Yes.

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. This is hard to answer. If I had the money, there would be quite a few things I would do but I think this is not the way I have been operating.

Mr. SIKES. You have limitations and you cannot go beyond those limitations. However, if you had the money what would you do?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. I think I would modernize O. & R. in Pensacola.

Mr. SIKES. That is one of the first things you would do?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. Yes, I think that is something that should be done in due time.

Mr. SIKES. How would you modernize it?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. By steps over about a 10-year period replacing the buildings——

Mr. SIKES. Replacing one building at a time and possibly consolidating present O. & R. activities?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. Yes, sir; while still utilizing the good buildings we do have at the maximum extent. I say again, this is based upon the assumption that we have the money, on which assumption I have never operated.

Mr. SIKES. The question was asked in that vein.

What would such an O. & R. improvement cost, roughly?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. I think that an estimate made 2 years ago runs a little bit over $10 million.

Mr. SIKES. How much would the first increment cost, if you have that information, and what would be follow-on costs, step by step?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. I could say $1.7 million depending upon what the future of operations at NAS, Pensacola, would be. If I intend to use that field mainly for training, the first increment would have to be a hangar and some parking areas for the planes now down on Chevalier Field.

Mr. SIKES. That would be about $1.7 million?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. That is about the estimate made about 2 years ago.

Mr. SIKES. I would like to have you supply for the record—I am sure you do not have it with you—a listing of the steps you see needed in this O. & R. field.

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. Yes.

(The material to be supplied follows:)

Plan for the development of O. & R., Pensacola, Forrest Sherman Field

Phase 1: Provide facilities to relocate O. & R. flight operations from Chevalier to Sherman Field:	
1. Hangar for minor repair, flight test	$500,000
2. Aircraft parking	210,000
3. Ground check area	340,000
4. Access road to hangar	32,000
5. Aircraft taxiway connection	60,000
6. Utilities extension	185,000
Subtotal	1,327,000
Phase 2: Provide avionics rework facility:	
1. Avionics building	1,700,000
2. Extension of electric power	240,000
3. Heating and compressed air plant	400,000
Subtotal	2,340,000
Phase 3: Provide aircraft paint facilities:	
1. Aircraft paint hangar	1,800,000
2. Aircraft parking	210,000
3. Extension of ground check area	340,000
4. Aircraft precleaning area	175,000
5. Security and industrial relations building	75,000
Subtotal	2,600,000
Phase 4: Provide aircraft disassembly and cleaning facilities:	
1. Disassembly hangar	625,000
2. Cleaning and paint stripping facility	645,000
3. Industrial waste disposal facility	450,000
4. Aircraft parking	504,000
5. Second increment to steam plant	250,000
Subtotal	2,474,000
Phase 5: Construct aircraft assembly hangar facilities:	
1. Aircraft assembly hangar	2,268,000
2. Aircraft parking	504,000
3. Access roads and parking	216,000
Subtotal	2,988,000
Phase 6: Provide aircraft rework support shops:	
1. First increment of shops	2,250,000
2. Widen access road	50,000
3. Supply department warehouse	600,000
Subtotal	2,900,000
Phase 7: Complete rework support shops and provide seaplane tow way and ramp:	
1. Second increment to shops	1,872,000
2. Seaplane tow way and ramp	175,000
Subtotal	2,407,000
Total all phases	16,676,000

Mr. SIKES. What would you consider the next most needed activity if money were not a limiting factor?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. I think that I would complete North Whiting for a cross-wind jet strip.

Mr. SIKES. At what cost?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. I think it is $3.5 million for the taxiways and the additional concrete overruns, and so forth.

Mr. SIKES. Where in this scheme of general discussion would you place the need for an outlying field at Whiting?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. Again, Mr. Sikes, I will say that as long as I have Eglin 1—and we will just limit it to Eglin 6—I would say that the outlying field would necessarily be very low on my priority list.

Mr. SIKES. That is all.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on this item?

NEED FOR NAAS, MERIDIAN

Mr. WHITTEN. Admiral, Meridian happens to be in my State. It is not in my immediate area, but in view of the rather full record which has been developed as to the overall situation, I do not care to pursue the matter in detail. However, if I understand it correctly, you have financed this base about 90 or 92 percent and have actually committed about 75 percent, as I understood your testimony. Is that correct?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. Yes.

Mr. WHITTEN. As I understood the testimony, it was stated that the operations you planned to put at Meridian were now being carried on in two locations under extremely dangerous conditions. In developing what course this committee and the Congress should take in regard to the request here which is necessary if Meridian is to be operated, could you take the locations where you are now carrying on this operation and could they be made safe with the expenditure of funds or is it something far beyond financing?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. It is a matter of airspace and the number of airplanes based in the same locality.

Mr. WHITTEN. Where you have a condition like that, the only thing to do is to find the means of getting some of the planes out; is that correct?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. That has been our objective.

Mr. WHITTEN. If you have crowded air, the only thing you can do is to uncrowd it by removing airplanes?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTEN. I was impressed by the wonderful record you made under all of those circumstances for safety and in making that record in this congested area, does it require more manpower, care, or does it hamper you to some degree to keep this safety record other than the conditions against which might prevail if you did not have such a crowded condition?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. I would say it possibly could be measured in manpower. I mean by that——

Mr. WHITTEN. I am trying to get into the question of extra difficulty.

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. We put a terrific emphasis on every safety factor that we have. We have a lot of officers and enlisted men working in the field of aviation safety in the Pensacola-Corpus Christi area and everywhere in the Navy wherever an airplane is flown.

Mr. WHITTEN. If you did not have Meridian in its present situation, would you have a need for such an area to relieve this congested situation you have, whether you have Meridian or not, but in the absence of it, would you see a real need to do something along the line to relieve the congestion you mentioned?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. I do not see how this would be possible under the existing circumstances, so I would say that we would go on operating under a congested airspace situation which no doubt could cause some loss of life.

Mr. WHITTEN. I say in the absence of Meridian, if you did not complete Meridian, you would recognize a need for some such base to relieve your situation?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. Yes, I would say we need an additional base.

Mr. WHITTEN. This goes back to one outlying field. Is that going to seriously hamper your operations in Meridian after you have put it in from the original plan?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. Not since we have reduced the field loading of Meridian, planned the field loading of Meridian from 200 to 125. This permits us to do some of the bounce touch-and-go type of landings on the main field at Meridian. We hope to be able to get by with that number.

Mr. WHITTEN. You pulled your operations in where it would fit one outlying field?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. I noticed you testified under present circumstances that using Meridian to relieve this situation will not result in closing any of these bases. In other words, if Meridian takes anything more than that which is essential to relieve your present problem from any of these other areas——

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. This is partially true and partially not true. It has not been brought out here that we still have not taken full delivery of all of the jets from North American we ordered from them. As they come in, they will be placed at Meridian and you cannot replace one propeller airplane by a jet. It takes more space, more field, for a jet operation than it does for a propeller operation.

To answer your question, I would say that the planes that are temporarily based at South Kingsville will move up there and that will relieve an airspace problem in Corpus Christi area where we have two fields, one operating advanced jets and one operating basic jets within a block from each other approximately.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am trying to get to this point: I am not trying to put words in your mouth but my question was directed to this point. Will you continue in the Corpus Christi area and in the other areas mentioned after you have fully implemented Meridian? Will each of them be maintained on a full-time basis to the maximum extent consistent with maximum safety standards? In other words, would you have all that you need in that area if you judge it of maximum safety for the operation?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. I would think that once Meridian is operated, the situation for airspace in the Corpus Christi area will not be what might be called ideal, but it will be operationally acceptable from a safety standpoint.

Mr. WHITTEN. Much better than at present?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. Than it has been in the past.

Mr. WHITTEN. When could you open up the operations at the Meridian base under present plans if the money here is provided and you proceed with the contracting and all that? What is the target date?

Captain BRIDGERS. September 1961.

May I add a little to the admiral's previous testimony?

I was the one who testified about the future effect upon the other bases, Mr. Whitten, and the thing to realize here is that the opening of Meridian in itself has absolutely no effect on the Corpus Christi area other than the removal of the interim basic jets which are at south Kingsville. It is in the basic training phase and, as such, has no effect on the advanced training conducted in the Corpus Christi complex.

Mr. WHITTEN. So the bases will operate and the safety factor, which is effecting all of these other areas, is of sufficient interest that, having a base there, you feel you should move that for this reason and no other; is that correct?

Captain BRIDGERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The gentleman on my left?

WORKLOAD IN CORPUS CHRISTI COMPLEX

Mr. JONAS. What would you have left at Kingsville if you moved the advanced jets to Meridian?

Captain BRIDGERS. We will have 150 advanced jets remaining at Kingsville. The basic jets at south Kingsville are the ones that go to Meridian——

Mr. JONAS. You do not plan to move any of the advanced jets from Kingsville to Meridian?

Captain BRIDGERS. No, sir.

Mr. JONAS. Just the basic jets?

Captain BRIDGERS. Yes, sir.

You see, Mr. Jonas, the basic jet trainer is a relatively nondemanding jet. The advanced jet is a fleet-type jet which is quite critical and they will remain in Kingsville.

Mr. JONAS. When you move the basic jets out of south Kingsville, why will you need Chase Field?

Captain BRIDGERS. Because under the existing and predicted situation, at the present we have at Kingsville 149 advanced jets and at Chase Field we have 124 advanced jets.

Mr. JONAS. Are they not too close to have advanced jet training?

Captain BRIDGERS. No, sir.

Mr. JONAS. How far apart are they?

Captain BRIDGERS. They are about 40 miles apart.

Mr. JONAS. Do they not use the same airspace?

Captain BRIDGERS. No, sir.

Kingsville uses this area [indicating] and Chase this area [indicating].

Mr. JONAS. You wanted to move advanced jet training out of Pensacola to Meridian because of the concentration?

Captain BRIDGERS. No, sir; there is no advanced training done in Pensacola. All advance training is done in the Corpus Christi area. The scale here is quite different. This location of Chase and Kingsville is on the scale of the larger map. This distance from Kingsville to Chase is equal to the entire Pensacola complex.

Mr. JONAS. How many jets are you moving out of Kingsville?

Captain BRIDGERS. Sixty.

Mr. JONAS. That will leave how many there?

Captain BRIDGERS. 150.

Mr. JONAS. How many do you have at Chase?

Captain BRIDGERS. 124 advanced.

Mr. JONAS. Would it not be better to concentrate on one of those fields? Why do you need 2 within 28 miles of each other?

Captain BRIDGERS. They are 40 miles apart and the load of 150 advanced jets at one field and 125 advanced jets at the other field is a good load for both stations. You could not combine that many advanced jets on one station.

Mr. JONAS. Because you have air problems?

Captain BRIDGERS. No, sir; primarily because there are several reasons. Airspace is one. Runway capability is another. Sheer facilities, barracks, BOQ's, mess, and so forth. We cannot put all of that advanced load on one station.

POSSIBLE CLOSURES IN AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Mr. JONAS. You said you are not planning to close anything when you open Meridian and yet there has been a substantial cutback in mission. Why do you not plan to close some of them?

Captain BRIDGERS. Sir, there has not been a substantial cutback in requirement based on plans. It is important to realize that. Right now, we have a training rate of 1,900 output per year. That training rate is projected right on out and even if there was a further decline in the 1,900 rate, we would still need all of the fields we now have, plus Meridian.

Mr. JONAS. Did you not say to Mr. Sikes that 5 years ago if you could visualize the situation today you would not have planned Meridian?

Captain BRIDGERS. I do not think I said that. I said I thought perhaps if we had been fortunate to look at an 8-year span, we may have done something else. By "something else," we could perhaps have developed some of the fields we do have differently, but that is 5 years of history.

Mr. JONAS. I understand. There have been changes in 5 years, but why do you not close something? Why do you not close something when you open Meridian?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. May I give you a little history on this thing? When I reported to the Training Command in 1957, we were at a 3,300 pilot training program and we also did not have jets in the basic training command. It was planned, but we did not have them at the time. We were operating at that time all of these fields you see here in this Corpus Christi area. These [indicating] have been closed since then. We had for training up in Hutchinson, Kans., that field which has been closed and we were using Corry Field, as I mentioned,

within 8 miles here, and we had some 700 airplanes flying around in circles. We have closed Corry Field in the meantime.

Mr. JONAS. Where is Corry?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. That is between Pensacola and Saufley.

A jet taking off from the north-south runway toward the north from NAS Pensacola actually passed within a few feet of the planes going around in the circle around Corry Field. That is why we were trying to expand our part of the Pensacola area and that is why Meridian and New Iberia were originally planned.

Mr. SIKES. Did you mention Barin?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. Yes, sir; we closed Barin. I did not mention Barin and we also were planning a base up at Brewton. We were planning a jet complex at Brewton but that was thrown out.

Mr. JONAS. Would you say the decision to close Corry Field and Barin and not open up Brewton was the result of opening Meridian?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. No, sir. Meridian was planned as an advanced jet-training base initially to get some of this congestion out of this Corpus Christi area caused by using Cabaniss and these other fields very close to Corpus Christi. We wanted to get out of this area and we wanted to get out of Hutchinson and get into the area down here [indicating].

Mr. JONAS. That is sufficient.

Captain, what school did you say you moved from Norman to Memphis?

Captain BRIDGERS. Partly the Technical Training Command, sir.

Mr. JONAS. Training schools?

Captain BRIDGERS. Yes, sir.

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. Technicians.

Mr. JONAS. When was that move made?

Captain BRIDGERS. That was in 1957, sir.

Mr. JONAS. At that time, did you know you wanted to concentrate your technical training at Memphis?

Captain BRIDGERS. It was part of the plan; yes, sir. That plan was in effect then.

Mr. JONAS. Is it desirable to have the school and the technical training at the same location?

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. This is part of the same thing. The term may be a little bit——

Mr. JONAS. Why was it originally established at Norman? Why did you not consolidate it when you established it?

Captain BRIDGERS. It was originally established at Norman, Okla.; Memphis, Tenn.; and Jacksonville, Fla., during the war. We had three big technical training centers at each one of those three bases.

Mr. JONAS. Including schools?

Captain BRIDGERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. Did you have a training center at Norman or only a school?

Captain BRIDGERS. There were several schools in the training centers, Mr. Jonas.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. JONAS. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the present status of Norman?

Captain BRIDGERS. The Navy has no further control over it, sir. I would have to look up the exact status but we do not have it any more.

Admiral RENKEN. I believe it has been reported excess to the Navy's needs.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you know what period of time?

Admiral PELTIER. Just in the last 2 or 3 months.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have maintenance costs there still for the protection of the property, I assume; or has it been translated into some other expenditure?

Admiral PELTIER. It is in GSA hands now.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All of it? All of the security goes into GSA-maintained hands until disposition?

Admiral PELTIER. We have to keep it a year and after that they pick it up.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Declared surplus and they take it over in 6 months?

Admiral PELTIER. One point on this: I was in the Technical Training Command in 1948 and we moved all of the Jacksonville and Norman facilities back into Memphis at that time. During the Korean expansion, we moved back as we could not take care of the load. It has always been planned to have the Technical Training Center at Memphis and that was back in 1947. That is 13 years ago and due to the load that was required for the Korean war——

Mr. JONAS. Did you say that the facilities at Memphis are not adequate for it now and will have to be expanded?

Captain BRIDGERS. That is true, Mr. Jonas. The facilities at Memphis are not only inadequate as to capacity but they are inadequate as to quality.

Mr. JONAS. Why did we not leave the school at Norman instead of closing Norman and building additional facilities at Memphis?

Captain BRIDGERS. It was not quite that way, sir. The maintenance of three separate training centers is quite an expense in itself. The object was to try to reduce expenses and consolidate.

Mr. JONAS. Do you say your studies indicated that it will be more economical as an operation to consolidate at Memphis, close down Norman, though you have to build additional facilities at Memphis?

Captain BRIDGERS. The studies do show that, sir.

Admiral GOLDTHWAITE. You will amortize your new construction in just about 2 years. That is a guesstimate.

Captain BRIDGERS. It is germane to the question, Mr. Jonas, that the units that came from Norman are presently at Memphis. The additional buildings of which we speak are buildings which are required to house certain heavy, expensive electronic equipment which is now improperly housed at Jacksonville. If they should have new buildings, regardless of their location, we would like to have them in Memphis in order to consolidate.

SCHOOL REQUIREMENT AT MERIDIAN

Mr. JONAS. You will have 1,800 military personnel at Meridian; is that right?

Captain BRIDGERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. 1,340 enlisted men?

Captain BRIDGERS. That is right.

Mr. JONAS. How many will be CPO's?

Captain BRIDGERS. Probably 110, sir.

Mr. JONAS. How many officers?

Captain BRIDGERS. 200 officers attached to the station and 180 student officers.

Mr. JONAS. 460. Take 1,340 out of 1,800 and it leaves 460.

I am merely trying to relate these numbers to the $1,996,000 you want to spend for recreation and support facilities at Memphis, community center $890,000, pool $169,000, CPO mess $104,000, enlisted men's club $279,000, open mess $367,000, and the theater $187,000.

You say you will not require any school at Meridian?

Captain BRIDGERS. My statement was, sir, that we have been advised that the Meridian schools can handle this load.

Mr. JONAS. What will you do, truck the students?

Captain BRIDGERS. Possibly by bus; yes.

Mr. JONAS. How far?

Captain BRIDGERS. Seven miles, sir.

Mr. JONAS. I thought it was stated to be 14 miles.

Captain BRIDGERS. There is a school on the far side of Meridian. I have not gone into that question, sir. If you want details I will be glad to inquire.

Mr. JONAS. If they are willing to accommodate the additional school load, why can they not provide recreational facilities if it is only 7 miles away? I think of the need for the theater, for example.

Captain BRIDGERS. The bus situation is a normal thing which happens all over the world. We would not run buses to take people into——

Mr. JONAS. We do not build theaters within 7 miles of all the civilian population in the country, either, do we?

Captain BRIDGERS. No, sir; we do not, but the civilian population by and large does not live that far from the theaters. We are talking now about the theaters, sir. They are in town and it is about 14 miles.

Mr. JONAS. I have no further questions.

POSSIBLE USE OF DEACTIVATED AIR FORCE FACILITIES

Mr. SIKES. This applies to the Navy generally and not to the Naval Air Training Command. The Air Force has just announced that it plans to close six primary contract flight training schools, two in Florida, two in Georgia, one in Texas, and one in Oklahoma.

Has the Navy been given such a list to determine whether there is a possibility that the Navy might use those facilities in lieu of some other less adequate facilities or in lieu of construction of new facilities?

Captain BRIDGERS. Yes, sir; we are aware of that, sir. We are aware of it since only last Friday. There are six bases concerned.

Mr. SIKES. For your information that is as soon as Congress became aware of it.

Captain BRIDGERS. Five of the bases are leased by contractors. One of them is owned by the air Force. They are all old construction. They all have 5,000-foot runways. I can see no possible use that we can make of them in lieu of anything that we have, Mr. Sikes.

Mr. SIKES. You say all are old construction. If you have been to see those bases, as I have, you will find that those bases, while the construction is in part World War II construction, all of them were substantially improved when contract operations began in the fifties. Those stations are generally in first-class condition, including air conditioning and soundproofing.

Captain BRIDGERS. I have not had the privilege of seeing them. I got my information from my opposite numbers.

I do know that the runways are 5,000 feet and that these bases were used for the T–28 and T–37 type trainers and they would not be, in their present configuration, any good to us as jet bases.

Mr. SIKES. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

NAVAL AIR STATION, WHIDBEY ISLAND, WASH.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Under date of April 18, 1960, we received a communication from the Honorable Franklin Lincoln, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Defense, having to do with a decrease in a series of line items and asking for a total of $7,031,000 for Whidbey Island, which we will insert in the record together with pertinent data on the Whidbey Island request.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

NAVAL AIR STATION, WHIDBEY ISLAND, WASH., RUNWAY, $7,031,000

This project is for the construction of a new 8,000-foot runway to replace the existing inadequate, deteriorated, northwest-southeast runway. The original project was authorized in fiscal year 1958 by Public Law 85–241 for construction of a 10,500-foot runway and acquisition of land. The necessary land, consisting of 753 acres adjoining the existing runway, has been acquired. The primary mission of NAS, Whidbey Island, is to support land-based patrol and heavy attack squadrons.

In order to adequately support these modern high-performance aircraft, it is necessary to have a runway configuration to cover all wind conditions. The present 7,050-foot runway is too short to safely handle the patrol and heavy at-

tack aircraft presently based at this station. Although we estimate the 10,500-foot long runway is a valid requirement, we are proposing to accept the risks of the shorter runway because of the cool climate at Whidbey Island and the Navy's tight budget. The wheel loadings of the modern high-performance aircraft, coupled with the poor soil conditions of the underlying ground, have caused the runway to deteriorate badly, thereby necessitating replacement. Continual repairs have failed to correct the basic cause. The new runway will be oriented slightly more to the east and west and will provide a better approach than the present runway.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., April 18, 1960.

Hon. HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The funding program submitted to your subcommittee in support of the fiscal year 1961 appropriation request for "Military Construction, Navy" totaled $190,227,000. The Department of the Navy has just advised this office of certain adjustments to this program due to (1) the decision to defer funding of the project for the extension of the runway at NAS, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and (2) recent changes in the cost estimates on three projects.

The following tabulation summarizes the above adjustments:

Facility class	Station line item	Estimated cost (thousands)	
		Current	Proposed
BuWeps	NAS North Is., San Diego, Calif: Carrier berthing	$5,000	$4,252
	Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, Calif.: Acquisition of land.	100	51
	MAS, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Runway extension	3,519	[1] 0
BuDocks	Public Works Center, Guam, M.I. Power system and land acquisition.	10,947	8,764
	Total	19,566	13,067
	Reduction of		6,499

[1] Defer.

In view of this reduction, it is desired that the following project be included in the Navy's fiscal year 1961 military construction funding program:

NAS, Whidbey Island, Wash., runway $7,031,000

The addition of this project revises the total of the Navy funding program to $190,759,000. The proposed adjustments have been reviewed and approved by the Bureau of the Budget and the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The Navy is authorized to present this proposal for consideration of your subcommittee and to make the necessary changes in the program and supporting data.

Sincerely,

FRANKLIN B. LINCOLN, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	DATE: 25 MARCH 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL AIR STATION, WHIDBEY ISLAND	OAK HARBOR, WASHINGTON	1452652
4. NEAREST CITY (Pop. over 12,000) Distance & Direction	**5. COUNTIES/COUNTRY**	**6. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE**	**7. NAVAL DISTRICT OR AREA**
EVERETT - 40 MILES SOUTHEAST	ISLAND SKAGIT, KITSAP	BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS	13TH NAVAL DISTRICT
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT	**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
FLEET SUPPORT	1942	☐ MAINTENANCE ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE ☐ NEW

SECTION II. MISSION

To maintain and operate facilities and provide services and material to support operations of aviation activities and units of the Operating Forces of the Navy and other activities and units, as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF.	EM	CIV.	STUDENTS	SUPPORTED	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 1 JANUARY 1960	76	885	690	0	2,530	4,181
2. PLANNED - END FY 1961	68	607	680	0	3,805	5,160
3. ULTIMATE - END FY 1963	65	608	680	0	2,618*	3,971

NO. OF AIRCRAFT — PRESENT 75 — PLANNED 126 — ULTIMATE 91

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *OFF 347 EM 2,271

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTALS (+)
1. OWNED	9,314	2,363,000	52,343,000	54,706,000
2. LEASED	1,214	(97)	84,000	84,000
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(Except Land Rent)		54,790,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				10,440,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				0
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				20,003,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				85,233,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
111	RUNWAY	SY	1,484,000 (157,000 SUBSTANDARD)	177,000	233,000	0	7,031	8,479	0	7,031

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST - INSTALLATION DATA

DD FORM 1390 (7-58) Supersedes DD FORM 1390

BOOK NO. I PAGE NO. 29A

639

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the basis for the cost reduction for power facilities at Guam?

Admiral PELTIER. We will relocate this new plant at the Piti location from Touman. This reduces the amount of land required. It reduces some oil pipeline required, and it also has reduced some of the water intake cost.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, the total difference between the two figures is based on the reduction in requirements?

Admiral PELTIER. Work not required at the new location but required at the old location. The basic cost of the boiler, and so on, has not been changed. Also the government of Guam now plans to pay a greater share of the cost than originally planned, based on a restudy of their load.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that based on a curtailment of expenditures or review?

Admiral PELTIER. Based on a restudy of this plant, locating it at Piti and increased financial participation by the government of Guam. When we originally planned for Touman we planned for 60,000 kilowatts. Our plans now are for 40,000. The second increment will be nuclear so that has changed our thinking on it and the economic analysis of it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why was not Whidbey Island included in the original program?

Admiral RENKEN. The project for the construction of the runway and land acquisition at Whidbey Island was included in the list of line items approved for fiscal 1959 in the amount of $373 million. In that year we received only $295 million in new obligational authority. We have completed only part of the project, the land acquisition. Because of the time required to acquire he land and because we did not have sufficient funds, we deferred the runway construction. If the $190 million requested this year in new obligational authority is granted there will be sufficient funds to proceed with the runway construction immediately since plans and specifications have been completed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the mission of this base and how firm is the mission established?

Captain BRIDGERS. It is twofold—it is the home of the heavy attack squadrons of the Pacific Fleet, and four land patrol squadrons. The mission is quite firm. It is one of the best air stations we have.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the existing runway situation at this base?

Captain BRIDGERS. The existing runway has a very poor subbase, and the heavy operations, especially by the heavy attack jets, are deteriorating it faster than was anticipated.

Rather than trying to make a major repair job we would like very much to construct a new runway which is needed not only as a replacement but also to reorient the runway slightly.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Because of the extremity of the water level you will have to build up the runway which brings about additional costs. Is that correct?

Admiral PELTIER. Our unit cost of $11 per square yard for airfield pavement is not out of line. That price is close to the average for the continental United States. Parts of this runway traverse low lying swamp-type terrain but the major portion is located on higher ground.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the extent of the cost of site preparation?

Admiral PELTIER. Site preparation here is estimated at $2,089,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will this require additional land acquisition in the future?

Captain BRIDGERS. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What percentage of the time of this runway is required to be used as compared to other runways?

Captain BRIDGERS. Roughly 50 percent.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on the item, gentlemen?

Mr. JONAS. Did I understand you to say, Admiral, that the land was acquired last year for this runway?

Admiral RENKEN. Mr. Tiencken can answer that.

Mr. TIENCKEN. Acquired in 1958.

Mr. JONAS. How long will the runway be?

Captain BRIDGERS. 8,000 feet.

Mr. JONAS. Will you then discontinue the use of the existing runway or reduce its load?

Captain BRIDGERS. Discontinue the use of it, sir.

Mr. JONAS. If you do not build the new runway you are in for a substantial cost in repairing the existing one. Is that right?

Captain BRIDGERS. That is correct, sir, plus the fact that in order to do such a job on this runway we could not continue to use it while the work was in progress, and the weather configuration at Whidbey Island is such that the runways are about equally used, depending on the season.

Mr. JONAS. I have no further questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you very much for your appearance and your responses, gentlemen.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

QUARTERMASTER RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING CENTER, NATICK, MASS.

TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1960.

WITNESSES

MAJ. GEN. L. E. SEEMAN, DIRECTOR OF INSTALLATIONS, OFFICE OF DIRECTOR OF INSTALLATIONS, ODCSLOG

COL. G. L. EVANS, JR., CHIEF, CONSTRUCTION DIVISION, OFFICE OF DIRECTOR OF INSTALLATIONS, ODCSLOG

COL. J. C. PENNINGTON, ACTING ASSISTANT QUARTERMASTER GENERAL FOR ADMINISTRATION, THE QUARTERMASTER GENERAL

LT. COL. L. R. MOORE, OFFICE, DIRECTOR OF ARMY BUDGET, OFFICE OF COMPTROLLER OF THE ARMY

H. B. NORWOOD, CHIEF, PROGRAM AND PLANNING BRANCH, ARMY CONSTRUCTION DIVISION, OFFICE, CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

L. A. WESTENBERGER, CHIEF, PUBLIC WORKS PLANNING BRANCH, CONSTRUCTION DIVISION, OFFICE OF DIRECTOR OF INSTALLATIONS, ODCSLOG

DR. F. A. H. RICE, CHIEF, RESEARCH BRANCH, RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING DIVISION, OQMG

J. F. ECSI, CHIEF, INSTALLATION PROGRAM OFFICE, INSTALLATIONS DIVISION, OQMG

COL. E. A. FLANDERS, CHIEF, INSTALLATIONS PLANNING BRANCH, REAL PROPERTY DIVISION, OFFICE OF DIRECTOR OF INSTALLATIONS, ODCSLOG

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall take up now the Quartermaster Research and Engineering Center at Natick, Mass.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM | FISCAL YEAR 1961 | DEPARTMENT ARMY | DATE 1 Mar 1960

I - INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. TYPE	4. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
Quartermaster Research & Engineering Center	Massachusetts	Permanent	
5. NEAREST CITY	**6. COUNTIES (If continental); COUNTRIES (If overseas)**	**7. COMMAND**	
Natick	Middlesex	Quartermaster	
8. PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OR PRODUCT		**9. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY**	**10. STATUS**
Research & Development		1953	Active

II - MISSION

To accomplish the Research, Development, Engineering and Standardization programs as assigned by the Quartermaster General; to translate development prototypes to mass producible items; and to provide technical services and engineering support to the Corps as directed by the Quartermaster General; to translate artistic designs of heraldic devices into heraldic items.

*Includes Food & Container Institute to be transferred from Chicago.
**One time cost for easement.

III - PERSONNEL STRENGTH

CATEGORY	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
1. PRESENT 30 June 1959	61	122	1415		1598
2. LONG RANGE (Phase I)	50	122	1392		1564

IV - INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTALS
1. OWNED	100	$ 103,351	$ 11,693,902	$ 11,797,253
2. LEASED	1	($ 438**)		$ 438
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 30 June 1959 (Except Land Rent)				$ 11,797,691
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				$ 0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				$ 3,628,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				$ 8,180,000
7. GRAND TOTAL				$ 23,605,691

V - INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FACILITY CLASS AND CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY				PHYSICAL CAPACITY (In units shown in Column e)				COST TO GOVERNMENT (In thousands of dollars)				
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	LINE ITEM NO. b	DESCRIPTION c	JUSTIFICATION PAGE NO. d	UNIT OF MEASURE e	PERMANENT FACILITIES INVENTORY 30 June 59 f	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED g	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30 Jun59 h	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED i	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES j	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDG 30June59 k	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED l	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED m	
310	15	Office and Heavy Lab Building	63	SF	308,730	96,315	0	59,375	1,783	0	1,783	1,783	14
310	16	Development Bldg Addn & Conversion	66	SF				29,940	1,643		1,643	1,643	13
310	17	Animal Laboratory Facilities	68	SF				7,000	168		168	168	15
721	18	EM Barracks Addition	71	MEN	68	16	0	16	34	0	34	34	16
										TOTAL	3,628	3,628	

62

DA FORM 1674-R, 1 AUG 57 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.

ACTIVITIES IN CHICAGO

Mr. SHEPPARD. What units or activities occupy space in the building in Chicago and to what degree?

General SEEMAN. While the Army has primary management, space is permitted to other Government agencies for certain activities. Some space is used by the 5th Army Headquarters. A small amount of storage space is used by the Army district engineer. Some space is used by the Navy. We have a table showing the exact square footage for each installation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That covers all the space outside of what the quartermaster is using himself for research and engineering purposes?

General SEEMAN. The 5th Army has 176,800 square feet; other Army activities, 54,000 square feet; the Food and Container Institute, 188,640 square feet; quartermaster, other activities, 153,260 square feet; the station overhead, 499,000 square feet; the Navy, 5,622 square feet; other than Department of Defense, which includes the post office, 567,860 square feet. There is vacant about 224,098 square feet. The total space within the building is 1,869,280 square feet.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Your justifications refer to the Army's abandoning the whole building in Chicago and appear to point out that the Food and Container Institute is the main stumbling block in your ability to inactivate this building. What consideration have you given to the cost of placing the other Defense Department activities in this building in other space?

General SEEMAN. This has been a problem, Mr. Chairman. There is already non-DOD space which I have accounted for, of over half a million square feet in use, post office and otherwise. We have been seeking tenants or clients for the building for years to try to make it a more economical operation, but with the declining strength and activities we just have not been able to do it. This is the problem now. Where the Food and Container Institute at one time was a smaller tenant of a larger operation, it now has become the primary overhead carrier, which makes an unconscionable demand on the quartermaster R. & D. activities, as we see it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has your presentation of this budget been costed out in detail by the General Services Administration and/or the Corps of Engineers if such space is available?

General SEEMAN. It has not been costed out in detail by the General Services Administration, Mr. Chairman. It has been primarily an Army problem up to date. The estimates were made at the Army level, with the primary agent, of course, being the Quartermaster Corps because they are the responsible agent. The Corps of Engineers has also been a primary participant in this estimate because of their responsibility for real estate and space and the fact that they were an occupant of part of the space in the building.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is our understanding, then, it has not been costed out with GSA.

Colonel FLANDERS. Sir, we have had only informal contact with them. They have explored possible uses they would make of the facility if it were excessed by the Army to them, under the hypothesis it would be excessed to them. There has been no formal action with them.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the square-foot charge to non-Defense Department activities for their space in this building, and how does this compare to their share of the operational costs?

General SEEMAN. This space to nondefense activity is 567,860 square feet, for which the annual reimbursement to the Department of the Army is $210,000. I am informed, Mr. Chairman, this is in accordance with an intergovernmental agreement for warehouse space of such type which, among governmental agencies, is 35 to 40 cents a square foot.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How does that compare with your present operational costs?

General SEEMAN. Our present overall operational costs I believe are in the nature of $2 million.

Colonel FLANDERS. That is approximately $1 a square foot. This, of course, averages laboratory space in with warehouse-type space.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is each one of these operations chargeable for its square footage?

General SEEMAN. They are all chargeable and participate in the cost except the Department of the Navy. The 5,622 square feet occupied by the Navy is nonreimbursed. Apparently among the services we do not enter a monetary transaction for small amounts.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that the only reservation you have in the cost factors insofar as your costs are concerned when you undertook to fill the vacant space in the Chicago building? Have you taken others, or is this the exception to the rule?

General SEEMAN. We have tried to get all the users we possibly could, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are currently charging the Post Office Department in Chicago 40 cents per square foot for space in this building. How does this compare to their payments for other similar space in the Chicago area, if you know?

General SEEMAN. I do not know what other space they have. All we have is the overall breakdown, $210,000 for the 567,000 square feet.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would supply the information for the record, please.

(The information requested follows:)

Information obtained from the Post Office Department indicates that they utilize no other similar type space in Chicago.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have you contacted GSA at all to determine if further utilization of space in the Chicago building would be possible?

General SEEMAN. We have made no formal contact with GSA, sir. However, they have the overall responsibility for general-purpose office space in that metropolitan area, and it is possible——

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are charged with a certain factor here insofar as your appropriation is concerned. Do you not think it might be well if you contacted them to see what their attitude might be in regard to the question I have just asked?

General SEEMAN. That is correct, sir. Of course, if the Army inactivates the building or disposes of it, it would become the General Services Administration's responsibility. They are not responsible for anything beyond general-purpose space. The requirement for the special-purpose space, such as our laboratory or other special-purpose space, would be dependent upon consultation with them in the future.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Their determination or yours?

General SEEMAN. Their determination, because they have the management responsibility. From the standpoint of a split operation and consideration of the Food and Container Institute alone, the Army is on record as desiring from an economical standpoint to consolidate its activities.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The testimony very clearly indicates that you have vacant space in the building. Have you contacted GSA to see whether or not they could fill the vacant space?

Colonel PENNINGTON. Yes. Of course, as you know, the question has been brought up with the Engineers. They have been contacted.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When was the contact made? How recently?

Mr. ECSI. A year and a half ago was the last contact. That is the time we generated cost statistics.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you not think under the normal procedure, a year and a half ago is somewhat antiquated so far as the potentiality as of today?

General SEEMAN. It does look like a long stretch of time. On the other hand, there have been no changes in the metropolitan area of Chicago in the other direction. The general trend has been a reduction of activities or requirements in the area. The 5th Army, because of the high overhead costs and because of the reduction of their activities and consolidation, have already taken steps to try to make economies and have started some move of their people.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is there anything wrong with the geographical location of this building?

General SEEMAN. It is in the industrial or stockyards area of Chicago where certainly the procuring and servicing of civilian help, clerk-typists and various other people, and the technical people of a laboratory nature, is very difficult, sir. They tell me that——

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is difficult upon what premise? Do people not want to work there? What particular criteria is involved here which prohibits this? There must be something outside the normal.

General SEEMAN. They tell me if they have any of their female personnel working overtime whatsoever, they have to be escorted several blocks to the nearest public transportation or to taxicabs or something else to get them in and out of the area.

POSSIBLE USE OF ILLINOIS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Mr. SHEPPARD. What consideration have you given to locating the Institute at the Illinois Institute of Technology in the Chicago area, which apparently has laboratory and other type facilities readily available for this type of work?

General SEEMAN. We have heard of a proposal by the Illinois Institute of Technology, which has been stated in general terms, by which they would propose to build a facility, and the figure which sticks in my mind is a $4 million to $5 million estimate. There has been no understanding of just what this is composed of. The terms by which the Army or the services would use this afterward have been stated in broad terms as at cost plus a nominal fee. The estimate we

have in our current request to provide for the Food and Container Institute operation at Natick is $3,314,000. There is just not enough——

IMPORTANCE OF CHICAGO AREA FOR CONTAINER WORK

Mr. SHEPPARD. Insofar as that type of operation is concerned, geographically speaking, is Chicago itself any more important than New York or Toledo or Cleveland or whatnot?

General SEEMAN. Chicago is an important area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why?

General SEEMAN. In the past it has been a center of marketing and food activity. However, the dispersal of industry and the dispersal of research and development activities throughout the country are such that it is not the center of operations that it was in the past. This is not to discount the very fine people and the very fine activities that are still going on in the area. However, the Army interest is not food alone. It is paper containers and can manufacturers. As you know, they have their headquarters and their research establishments scattered throughout the country. I believe 51 percent of the research of the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute is done in-house, and 49 percent by contract. The contracting work is done from the Quartermaster Research and Engineering Command in Natick. They feel they can accomplish quite significant economies by consolidating.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is because of association. In other words, if I am producing a certain instrument or item for public consumption, whether it be canned goods or something else, the packaging requirements are more or less basic. It does not mean I have to have it done in my back yard. I may have it done somewhere else. That has been done by industry across the country, as far as that is concerned.

General SEEMAN. The requirements of Army rations, as you know, are somewhat different. It is not strictly a peacetime operation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I grant you that.

General SEEMAN. It is not a salable article as such.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Army establishes its own criteria and procedures. You can apply that requirement in any geographical area you want to as long as you know what the packaging requirement is, refrigerated or otherwise. Is that right?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

CHANGE IN ARMY PLAN, TO KEEP FOOD AND CONTAINER RESEARCH IN CHICAGO

Mr. SHEPPARD. In presenting to the Congress your program for the consolidation at Natick in 1952, the Secretary of the Army stated that the food and container research must remain in Chicago and no future request would be made to Congress for supporting facilities for it at Natick unless there should be a complete change in the character of the laboratory. What complete change in the character of the laboratory has taken place since 1952 to justify the difference in concept between what was testified then and what is now presented?

General SEEMAN. That is correct, Mr. Chairman. In 1952 the Army had no intention of moving from Chicago. However, that was 8 years ago. As I mentioned, this 1,800,000-square-foot building now is a chain around the neck of the Food and Container Institute, which then was a smaller tenant and now is the primary one.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is the major tenant.

General SEEMAN. Yes, the primary Army tenant.

Mr. SHEPPARD. To support the capital investment you obviously must have other activities.

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In Chicago there are no more potential available tenants to use the space available?

General SEEMAN. We absolutely know there are none in the Army from a cost and operational standpoint, and we have no knowledge of any other in the Government, although you have justly commented upon the time since our last consideration.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Chicago Chamber of Commerce issues a brochure twice a year in which they delineate the industrial requirements for space occupancy. How closely has that been reviewed to see whether or not there is a potential occupant in that list?

General SEEMAN. I have no knowledge of that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have you ever seen a copy of it?

Colonel PENNINGTON. No, sir; I do not recall it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have local commands within the area.

Colonel PENNINGTON. Yes, sir

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would it not be easy to ask them to pick up a copy of the report of the Chicago Chamber of Commerce? One came to my office this morning, the first time I have received it in many years. It delineates the business space occupancy within the area. I am talking about the geographical area centered on the city of Chicago. You know nothing about that particular source of information, is that correct, General?

General SEEMAN. That is correct, sir. If I hight make one comment: This building, as you know, was a depot building during World War II. It is comprised essentially of warehouse space. In its present condition only a small portion is suitable for office space. If the Food and Container Institute, for example, stays there, it has a requirement for in the neighborhood of a million dollars of modification to make proper laboratory and administrative space out of this warehouse space. This is one of the big problems. It is not general-purpose space of the kind that is needed in a modern office building, in the first place.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is not adaptable to that, is that correct?

General SEEMAN. Not without major expenditure, sir.

VALIDITY OF BUDGET ESTIMATES

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do the cost figures you have submitted for the Natick facilities reflect your latest estimate in this respect?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir. We do not have a representative of the Corps of Engineers here this afternoon because he is on the Senate side of the Capitol, sir. They advise me that preliminary designs are

complete on two of these items, and essentially about 70 or 80 percent complete on two, and they have preliminary estimates on these four items.

Mr. SHEPPARD. My data from reliable sources indicates that the total cost is now estimated at $3,260,000.

General SEEMAN. Our request is $3,628,000, sir, but of that, $3,314,000 is for the Food and Container Institute accommodation. I have the highest regard for the people on the staff of the committee. I also have been caught between the crossfires of estimators many times. It is entirely possible that with the plans further along they have received later information than filtered to us in the preparation of the budget.

COMPARATIVE MAINTENANCE COSTS

Mr. SHEPPARD. What studies has the Corps of Engineers made with reference to the construction and the maintenance of the Chicago facilities as compared with the cost of the new facilities requested?

Colonel FLANDERS. The anticipated facilities cost of operation of the Chicago administrative center will remain essentially as in the past. The cost per square foot for operation and maintenance of the new facilities at Natick will be a higher amount, probably running in the neighborhood of $2.30 a square foot against $1 a square foot average for the total Chicago administrative building. This square footage will be limited to that which is required for the mission, and the total costs of operation for all missions in the Chicago administrative center on relocation are estimated at $721,000 annually.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Assuming that you move all of the operations within the Chicago area at the moment to Natick, then what would be the answer as compared with those you may not move because they do not want to move?

Colonel FLANDERS. If we move all the occupants of the Chicago administrative center to Natick and to other locations, $721,000 is the estimated cost. This is not the container institute alone. This includes all the activities we would relocate out of the building.

ADEQUACY OF CHICAGO FACILITIES

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am wondering if you can tell us whether or not the officials of the Food and Container Institute unit in Chicago consider the present laboratory facilities there to be unsatisfactory and inadequate. Have you a report from them covering that feature of the problem?

General SEEMAN. Sir, we have the comments and recommendations of the responsible command agencies. I have also heard informally that individual members of the Food and Container Institute feel that a move would not be justified. This represents their personal opinion, and we have the highest regard for the opinion of those individuals. They are motivated by many conflicting sentiments, just as I am, that of homeownership, working in the area——

Mr. SHEPPARD. What would be the distance, General, between Chicago and Natick?

General SEEMAN. It is roughly 1,000 to 1,100 miles from the Midwest to the New England area. The Quartermaster research and de-

velopment people have estimated they would actually have a saving of $198,000 in reduced overhead, reduced personnel responsible for housekeeping, reduced travel, telephone calls, and things like that, in their annual cost of operating. That savings makes total estimated savings on an annual basis of around $1,250,000.

CONTROLLED STORAGE SPACE

Mr. SHEPPARD. One of the requirements of this type of activity, as the committee understands, is for controlled storage space to test foods under certain conditions. How does the space presently available in Chicago compare, volumewise, with that which you are proposing to provide at Natick, and how does this compare with the total requirement estimated in the several years the cost must be amortized?

General SEEMAN. Volumewise, spacewise, there is much more space available in the Chicago administrative center. However, as I have indicated, it is not available without major modification. The space to be constructed at Natick will be designed and built from the ground up——

Mr. SHEPPARD. General, I am talking about controlled storage space to test foods under certain climatic conditions which, as I understand, they are exposed to in this activity.

General SEEMAN. Of course, consolidating at Natick does bring them alongside their primary objective of developing Army rations.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What do you provide internally to give them a better ability for evaluation of the commodities they have to put through the test laboratory than you have presently existing?

Colonel PENNINGTON. Sir, the climatic control laboratories which we will use are already constructed at Natick. We do not have a comparable facility at Chicago.

STATIC DROP TEST FACILITIES

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is indicated by your justifications and information obtained by our investigators that there is another reason for the transfer related to the use of facilities of Natick by the Institute. One of the major areas of the Institute's research relates to aerial delivery, static drop-testing equipment. It is our understanding the Institute uses an elevator shaft in Chicago for this work, which has been equipped with closed-circuit television and other items so tests can be programed over the entire year regardless of weather conditions. If that is true, then I ask, what facilities of this type exist at Natick for this work at this time or are contemplated in the future?

Colonel PENNINGTON. We are using outdoor facilities, airdrop actually in the field area at Natick for the tests rather than a shaft such as they have at Chicago.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This is somthing we want to be careful about, because apparently we have conflicting information. It is my understanding that the facilities at Natick consist of a crane parked adjacent to a concrete slab which can only be used in proper weather. We realize that there is certainly a different type of weather a goodly portion of the time at Natick compared to that at Chicago. Is that information right or wrong?

Colonel PENNINGTON. I would have to get you a report on that. I would not want to comment on that. I do not know for sure.

General SEEMAN. There is no question in my mind that that particular item may be one segment of a program which in itself might be adversely affected. However, one segment versus the total research and development program will not govern the entire program.

Colonel PENNINGTON. The facility of dropping down a shaft is probably a makeshift operation, I would surmise, at Chicago.

Dr. RICE. That would come under the heading of "Apparatus," and I am certain it could be moved.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has that portion of the operational requirements been analyzed so far as evaluating the transferability of this operation; or has it not?

Dr. RICE. Yes.

General SEEMAN. All activities have been integrated in the studies of the Quartermaster Corps. As you know, the amount of drop and the kind of surface you have for various types and weights of containers depend upon tactical conditions. Some of this is also carried on at Fort Lee, where they have aerial cargo container tests. It must be fitted into the overall Army program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There is assurance at the moment that tests of this type can be made at Natick as at Chicago?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If we do not have the ability to do it at Natick, you will provide it; is that it?

General SEEMAN. We will provide it either there or somewhere else where we have existing capability.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If we are going to move into a consolidated operation, let us move into it and not refer it to another place which we have to build up. This particular operation, as I understand it, although I may be in error, is for a specific purpose, to accomplish a specific end result, generally speaking.

General SEEMAN. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If we are to substitute Natick for Chicago, then are we to have the availability of all the mechanical devices and inherent attributes which go into a testing operation of this general character; or are we not?

General SEEMAN. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will we have to provide them at Natick and build it up again to be comparable to some degree with Chicago?

General SEEMAN. We are, sir. Perhaps I was trying to be too precise because of these other policies of what we must do to the maximum extent in commercial and other type facilities, and not get into the operation directly as far as the Government is concerned. Natick is to provide for the full requirements of the Food and Container Institute.

FOOD RADIATION RESEARCH

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then there is another proposal in the works which relates to the Institute's Food Radiation Division. What studies have been made to determine whether or not additional travel would be required if the Institute is moved from Chicago to Natick?

General SEEMAN. Dr. Morse, of Army R. & D. staff, was asked similar questions by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. As you know, irradiation may be significant in the matter of preserving and processing foods. It is under study by the research and development people in the Army, and the Research and Development Command of the Quartermaster Corps has that responsibility.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have they reached a determination as to whether it is literally necessary to determine and evaluate their radiation requirements? Are they available in Chicago or available at Natick?

Colonel PENNINGTON. I will refer that to Dr. Rice.

Dr. RICE. At the moment, a committee is being set up to study that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Doctor, please, I do not want to be quarrelsome about this. This presentation is made to us for a pretty heavy transfer of activities and a large investment. If you are studying it, you cannot possibly have a determination of the cost until you have completed your study. Until such time as your study has been completed, can you actually evaluate the dollar investment required? Can you or can't you?

Dr. RICE. We can't.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You cannot. So, obviously, insofar as the study is concerned, at the moment it has no bearing on the issue. It has not been completed. It is merely an estimate. Is that not true? I do not want to embarrass anybody, but is that not literally the fact?

General SEEMAN. It is being evaluated through the Research and Development Command. As you know, in the news there was the question of whether it was opportune at this time to enter into a contract for a reactor for irradiating foods, and the determination was made to defer that consideration. The committee Dr. Rice mentioned will study whether that is premature or not. But the organization at Natick and of the Food and Container Institute, wherever it may be, is being developed to be adaptable to the decision when it comes out, when they reach their scientific conclusion.

(Off the record.)

AVAILABILITY OF HOUSING AT NATICK

Mr. SHEPPARD. What housing is available on the post and off post at Natick?

General SEEMAN. At Natick they have an existing permanent barracks space for men, and there is not any great number of military personnel there. They have 68 permanent barrack spaces and their requirement is 84. Our request this year, Mr. Chairman, is for 16 men additional. These men at the Chicago Administrative Center have no barracks whatsoever. They are provided for on separate rations and commutations.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the family housing situation at the moment?

General SEEMAN. Natick and Maynard are considered together. One is a satellite of the other. They are within a few miles of each other and there are four sets of quarters on Maynard which were acquired with the property, as I understand it. Your committee did approve some time ago, I believe 2 years ago, a Capehart project for Natick of 35 units. We had this developed up to the point of adver-

tising and then the authority to go ahead was withdrawn by the Department of Defense, and we have never put it under contract.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you have a deficiency of housing?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir; there is a deficiency.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the total amount?

General SEEMAN. I will supply that for the record. I do not have it here.

(The information to be supplied follows:)

The total family housing required for eligible personnel assigned to the QM R. & E. Center under current authorized strength is for 69 units. Considering the existing 4 units, referenced above, there is a current deficiency of 65 units, consisting of 33 officers' quarters, 28 noncommissioned officers' quarters, and 4 quarters for key civilians who should live on post.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have you completed and presented your requirement for family housing in the present budget?

General SEEMAN. No, sir. We have not included any relative costs of family housing because if the people are in Chicago they are given commutation of quarters and find their own housing. If they move to Natick some will be on the civilian economy and some will be in family quarters, which is, in principle, amortized by the withholding of their rental allowances.

MOVEMENT OF PERSONNEL

Mr. SHEPPARD. What proportion of the total personnel in Chicago will move to Natick?

General SEEMAN. The total strength of the Food and Container Institute?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Everything that you are going to move from point A to B, the Institute or other.

General SEEMAN. 220 personnel of the Food and Container Institute are now occupied—no, 252 are now occupied in Chicago. The requirement at Natick will be fulfilled by 220, and there is an indication of some of the savings in personnel space due to consolidation.

LIAISON REQUIREMENT WITH MILITARY SUBSISTENCE SUPPLY AGENCY

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is the committee's understanding that the work of the Institute requires close liaison with the Military Subsistence Supply Agency and the Army Subsistence Center, both located in Chicago.

What is the volume of this activity, comparatively speaking?

Colonel PENNINGTON. I will ask Mr. Ecsi to answer that.

Mr. ECSI. There are two ways to look at this liaison. We have compared it in this manner: The liaison with headquarters will be considerably simplified, in comparison with the liaison with MSSA and the Army Subsistence Center which would be increased. Whether the liaison simplification with headquarters amounts to a total of 32 people, this more than offsets the loss of liaison with MSSA and with the Army Subsistence Center.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you feel you are offsetting the deficiency by the consolidation of the other?

Mr. Ecsi. Yes, sir.

Mr. Sheppard. How do you propose to handle this liaison work which is now, according to information we have, requiring some 4,000 contacts per month just by telephone, if the Institute is moved from Chicago? What provision are you making to cover that situation?

Mr. Ecsi. In the first place, the 4,000 figure was stated out there, also. It was concluded that of the amount that was reported, half of which would be unnecessary if they were not so close to each other, and the balance they would take care of through liaison visits, telephone, correspondence, and things of that sort.

Mr. Sheppard. Am I to conclude from your statement that you mean because of the proximity we are increasing the requirement as against a related distance, or eliminating a continuity of the so-called liaison contacts?

Mr. Ecsi. Yes, sir. If the person was accessible right next door, you would visit him more frequently than if you had to go to Philadelphia to visit him. That is what we tried to conclude in that.

Mr. Sheppard. Does the move increase or decrease the telephone communications cost or requirement by and between the two agencies?

Mr. Ecsi. We felt it would decrease.

Mr. Sheppard. Because of distance?

Mr. Ecsi. No, sir; because of being able to resolve some of the very questions they had unto themselves and not having long-distance calls in the frequency they would have local calls.

Colonel Pennington. To bring the two research elements together.

Mr. Sheppard. On the one hand, you tell me it is centralized as a requirement and now you are moving away from that position. By going to Natick, my question is directed to whether or not you are intensifying both personnel and the communications aspect versus being here? You say, or what I interpret you to say, and I may be wrong, is that we accept a phone call anyway, and maybe that was not your intention to convey that thought.

Colonel Pennington. May I relate that to contracts? I believe we have already given the figures in the record at about 15 percent of the annual contracts being let in the Chicago area versus 85 percent elsewhere. That would give us some indication of the amount of contact we have if we are talking with industry in that area.

General Seeman. We are not certain from the figures of 4,000 calls whether some of those calls involve a chain reaction where the caller has to turn around from Chicago and call Natick. There is a three-way operation in there. It is complex and it may be that one call in the future will take the place of two. In our study there was a general statement made that there would be reduced communications and costs, but there was no dollar figure placed upon that communications element.

Mr. Sheppard. In either event, and assuming that we are speaking of Washington for the moment, if I call the Department of Defense, the Department of the Army, that is an immediate thing, is it not?

General Seeman. Yes, sir.

Mr. Sheppard. In my opinion, the call is required and you have to get an answer from somebody. Then how are you going to get an answer at Natick as compared to Chicago?

General SEEMAN. The primary thing is bringing together the two research and development elements from Chicago and putting them under one head, where the head man can say that the best man to have that information is so-and-so. If I have to have that in a short time, I am going to go directly to him and then tell his boss later. For the running of the organization, keeping the railroad on the track for the long-range future, where you do not have to have it in a matter of moments, you can go to the top man because you are going to hold him responsible later on. There is a lot of the element of command in that, I am sure, that you appreciate.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There are a lot of elements involved but the basic element involved is that of management?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is going to be a contributing factor to the total of expenditures and returning not only to your communications aspect, but many other aspects.

General SEEMAN. The two significant things are this management factor that you put your finger on and the fact that we have a large housekeeping overhead problem in this big building which we can no longer justify.

IMPORTANCE OF CHICAGO AREA FOR THIS WORK

Mr. SHEPPARD. The hub of the Food and Container Industry is in the Chicago area, including not only the major packers, the research and development associates organization which has been set up primarily under Army sponsorship to work with the Food and Container Unit, and the major colleges of the country which offer courses in container activities, but what specific consideration have you given to the loss of this type of contact with industry and your own advisory organizations if this move is made? You created this, of course.

Colonel PENNINGTON. Colonel Haase from the Office of the Chief, Research and Development, can speak to that.

Colonel HAASE. Last week I attended in Chicago the 14th Annual Meeting of the Research and Development Associates which you referred to, Mr. Sheppard. During the course of this meeting, the chairman of the meeting assured General McNamara, who was a speaker at that meeting, that the Research and Development Associates would fully support and continue to cooperate with the Quartermaster General and the food and container people in the event that the Institute were to be moved to Natick. I feel that, insofar as that aspect of your question is concerned, we can be confident of continued close relationships.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I ask you this question: If they want to sell their merchandise they had better cooperate, is that right? Their offer was anything but generous.

Colonel HAASE. They will go where the business is.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is purely an operational requirement, is it not?

Colonel HAASE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There is no reason to say it is not justified, but nevertheless when it comes to the basic problem that is it, is it not?

Colonel HAASE. That is right.

Colonel PENNINGTON. Maybe the answer I gave a minute ago was more appropriate here. We did determine that out of the contracts we let with the universities, primarily we get these contracts let out on research, and only 15 percent were let in the Chicago area, while 85 percent were let all over the United States.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I understand that.

OPERATION OF CHICAGO CENTER GSA BUILDING

There appears to be no question as to the utility value of the buildings in the Chicago area.

What study has been made, to your knowledge, by the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, or anyone in the executive branch of the Government to determine the validity of maintaining this building as a Government building rather than a military facility?

General SEEMAN. We presented, in the course of coming up to you with this program, our economic study. It has been approved by the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget. The estimated value of the building in its present state is in the neighborhood of $4.8 million. If and when the adjustment can be made to vacate the activities from the building and it is reported to the Department of Defense and GSA, then it becomes their responsibility.

ANIMAL LABORATORY

Mr. SHEPPARD. In this budgetary requirement, you gentlemen made the request here for animal laboratory. Why is it necessary to locate this facility 12 miles from the Natick Quartermaster Laboratory?

General SEEMAN. This refers to the Maynard facility which is the satellite of the Natick, as you recall.

Colonel PENNINGTON. I can answer that. We do not have the facility at Natick itself, and due to regulations and restrictions we have placed that out at the Maynard site which is 12 miles away. We have this space, open area, and we can build the facility or exercise areas, and so forth, for the animals that we are testing as opposed to the Chicago area where now some of that testing has been done in the basement area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are the regulations that have to do with this particular function?

General SEEMAN. May I supply it for the record?

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right.

(The information to be supplied follows:)

Animal experimentations are required to supplement human studies in the research and development program. Investigation of climatic stress and nutrition upon operational efficiency using human subjects has about reached the limits of extreme or hazardous combat conditions to which it is desirable to submit human volunteers. It is also difficult to use human subjects for experiments lasting more than a few days without boredom complicating the results.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What contact have you had with the Natick Board of Health and other authorities with reference to the possibility of constructing the laboratory on the base or immediately adjacent thereto?

Colonel FLANDERS. The main animal location is outside the Natick township, in the country area. That is one of the reasons for the selection of Natick.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What consultation have you had with them as to the admissibility of that kind of a function within the area off the military installation?

General SEEMAN. We will supply that for the record, Mr. Chairman. I do know one of the reasons for going there was the unsatisfactory condition in Chicago where we are, I am told.

This is not in agreement with the health authorities in Chicago, having animals in the basement of this building or accommodating them at a very poorly——

Mr. SHEPPARD. We have many States and many counties which have their own regulatory procedures on animal treatment within a certain geographical area relative to so-called zoning aspects.

(The information to be supplied follows:)

The township of Natick has established certain regulatory limitations concerning the maintenance of animals within its borders. For this reason it was decided to locate this facility at Maynard.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now, I ask you this question: I do not know what the attitude of the State or county may be at the moment, but do you gentlemen know? If you do not know, find out. You may walk into something that is more severe than the place you are presently in. It could be.

General SEEMAN. We will provide that.

(The information to be supplied follows:)

The Maynard site, located approximately 12 miles from Natick, contains 2,948 acres of land and is situated in a farm or rural-type area which permits the maintenance of animals. The Army will be guided by local custom and community relationship in the Maynard area as necessary.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are requesting 7,000 square feet for this laboratory. What are you using in the way of space now with reference to the Institute and the Natick installation?

General SEEMAN. This is 7,000 square feet in the animal laboratory.

Colonel PENNINGTON. We are actually bringing the animals in by trucks and trailers. We go out on a contract with the local farmers, get animals we require, and take them away. We do not have space as such as Natick.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have you considered, or do you now plan in the future any use of maintenance and operation funds to convert existing facilities to animal laboratories?

Colonel PENNINGTON. I am positive that has been considered but the facilities we have at Maynard are not adequate to convert being the old World War II type buildings.

General SEEMAN. The present operations are being funded by a combination of O. & M. and R. & D. funds to meet the requirements of their program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In your justifications, you make a great point about the fact that the Food and Container Institute pigs are housed in an unventilated basement area of a warehouse-type building.

Let me ask you this question: How long has it been since the Food and Container Institute used pigs and this area in its work and what are their future plans for the use of this type of animal?

Colonel PENNINGTON. I did not get the last part of your question. We are currently using them.

General SEEMAN. How long?

Colonel PENNINGTON. How long since?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes, since you used the unventilated basement area.

Colonel PENNINGTON. I cannot answer that question but I can get you the answer. Dr. Rice says at least 2 years.

General SEEMAN. It is a part of the plan of operation in the future indefinitely.

CENTRALIZATION OF FACILITIES AT NATICK

Mr. WHITTEN. I have listened to and read through this investigative report and may I say that 21 to the point you have made, General, our investigators reached a conclusion that your justifications do not support your requested move. For instance, in your statement, you mention the inadequate facilities at Chicago, but the evidence before us is that you have about 1,917 square feet air conditioned for use for the animal facility. I understood you to say that this was in the stockyard area and I cannot see that it is surprising you have animals in a building in the stockyard area. I have been there many times.

Another subcommittee just finished providing funds for a big animal laboratory out in Ames, Iowa, and all of it to be inside for very sound reasons. Doubtless that is where you are going to keep animals. Where did this move from Chicago to Natick originate? I wonder if the movement of real estate in the Natick area might have interested some people or if the military just wanted to get a big operation at Natick? Where did this start so far as the record shows?

General SEEMAN. I have not heard of any particular real estate interests involved. Of course, they sometimes intrude in many considerations.

The decision to go to Natick, to take over and make use of that area, was made after the war and it was established based upon future requirements as they then saw them, in and near the institutions in the New England area.

Mr. WHITTEN. In that connection, on what date did you go to Natick and what do you do at Natick now? Describe briefly what the Natick operation is as it now stands.

General SEEMAN. As I mentioned before, the decision was made after the war, between 1951 and 1958. They have completed about $10.7 million acquisition value of the installations.

There was a laboratory building in this first increment, and we are adding to it in the request this year, which was built at a cost of $9.5 million and completed in September 1954.

Mr. WHITTEN. What did you initially plan to have at Natick when you started out there?

General SEEMAN. The Quartermaster Research Command has functions on rations, food preservation, and other areas; it provides the headquarters to handle all of their research and development activities.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is now the overall plan in Natick but what did you have before you put it at Natick?

General SEEMAN. Colonel Pennington, do you know?

Colonel PENNINGTON. We had part Chicago, part Jeffersonville, and part Washington.

Mr. WHITTEN. You brought all of those operations in and presumably you got it under some supervisory head at Natick?

General SEEMAN. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTEN. When you made those plans, quite definitely you determined that part of your operations at Chicago did not fit into the Natick plans and then you set out and operated it separately, did you not?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir. In 1952——

Mr. WHITTEN. You did that because in the Chicago area you have Armour, Swift, and all of these big packing companies. You have fine schools and you have a ready market for technicians and trained personnel. You recognized that when you set out to consolidate and you left that part for the very reason it was where it ought to be?

General SEEMAN. As we saw it at that time under the conditions then.

ARMY OPERATION OF FACILITIES IN CHICAGO

Mr. WHITTEN. The only thing that has changed is that you have been leasing this big building for half rent, according to the record. The Post Office Department for instance, is paying $1 a square foot and you are charging 40 cents. You left a lot of it vacant and the Post Office Department wants to rent it. The GSA says you have not even talked to them about getting help to rent it.

Have you let that condition prevail so as to build up your case to get this committee to help you, or is that the way the Army runs its business?

General SEEMAN. Several studies have been made over the years.

Mr. WHITTEN. I know, but this is a fact.

General SEEMAN. To try to improve the situation.

Mr. WHITTEN. You are paying a dollar, and then the other man is charging 35 cents. You are telling us how costly it is to operate, and in the same breath you are telling us that some of the space is vacant. You tell us how little income you have and then the Post Office Department is paying everybody else a dollar but paying you 40 cents.

General SEEMAN. If the Post Office Department and the GSA were willing to pay the cost of it, they have not come forward and offered.

Mr. WHITTEN. General, who runs this building?

General SEEMAN. The Army runs this building.

Mr. WHITTEN. All right.

General SEEMAN. But the GSA has this agreement and will not pay more than 35 cents a square foot.

Mr. WHITTEN. Who will not?

General SEEMAN. The GSA.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thought you said you had not taken it up with them?

General SEEMAN. This agreement for space is a DOD–GSA regulation; that is right.

Colonel FLANDERS. This is a regulation promulgated a number of years back between the Department of Defense and the General Services Administration.

Mr. WHITTEN. Does it run in perpetuity or do you review it every year?

Colonel FLANDERS. It runs in perpetuity. Perpetuity is a little bit too exaggerated perhaps.

Mr. WHITTEN. It has no ending date?

Colonel FLANDERS. It has no ending date.

Mr. WHITTEN. Which means that you can raise the issue any time you want to? You can raise the point and you have not raised it? Why?

Colonel FLANDERS. Not unilaterally, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. You mean you cannot raise the question with General Services? It is costing us a dollar to operate and you are paying almost 70 cents of that. What precludes you from raising it?

Colonel FLANDERS. The point can be raised.

Mr. WHITTEN. It can be raised?

Colonel FLANDERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. You have not raised it. Is it just to build up a case for Natick, or what?

Colonel FLANDERS. No; this is a nationwide situation. The Army benefits by this regulation in other areas just the way the Post Office benefits by this regulation.

Mr. WHITTEN. Now you have carried me one step further. Instead of charging up this loss in Chicago we have to match it with what you benefit by in other areas; is that right?

General SEEMAN. If it comes——

Mr. WHITTEN. If it is costing you 65 cents now, you say we have to match what you save in Memphis or Cincinnati; is that correct, General?

General SEEMAN. Colonel Flanders has indicated that here are isolated cases where there are benefits, but for the purpose of analyzing this particular problem, we could not take all of those considerations into account. This question of space is only one of the elements with regard to this operation.

Mr. WHITTEN. I realize that, but I also understood you to say that it was of major importance in your earlier statements to the chairman.

General SEEMAN. It is of major importance.

Mr. WHITTEN. Are you precluded from raising this point? If you are losing this money, will you not talk to your tenants about paying higher rent and will you not even talk to your tenants about ranting more space? Apparently you will not because you have not done so.

Is there anything that precludes you from releasing to GSA such part of the building as you do not need?

General SEEMAN. An appraisal of the building by the Crops of Engineers indicated that it was a building very difficult to sell. It is a building of several stories with three primary wings. I understand the question of heat is not easily resolved.

Mr. WHITTEN. How many tenants does the Army have where you furnish the heat? What they frequently desire is central heat and that is the direction we are going in now.

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. Even in the services, that is where you are going.

General SEEMAN. I realize it is not a simple question because I have already testified that a good part of the space is unheated space. It is not a simple solution.

PROPOSED MOVEMENT TO NATICK

Mr. WHITTEN. Natick was set up to bring together those things that needed to be brought together, and at that time you recognized a need to have this particular thing in Chicago.

What change has come about in Chicago other than your operation of this building that keeps that from still being the center of the food and container work? You still have all of these big food companies, school, etc., 15 percent of your contracts are in Chicago? That is a tremendous percentage to be located in one area.

General SEEMAN. Sir, I regret awfully to discuss companies or types of industry because it looks like we are being critical of them.

I have read in the papers where Armour, Swift, and other big meat-packers are decentralizing to Sioux City, Kansas City, California, and other places. They are doing this to be more efficient in their operations and here we are trying to consolidate at Natick because it is an R. & D. function primarily. It is not a food-producing——

Mr. WHITTEN. They are decentralizing and here you want to centralize?

General SEEMAN. It is a different kind of operation.

IN HOUSE RESEARCH IN FOOD AND CONTAINER FIELD

Mr. WHITTEN. It is, but in this whole field—I am sure the military have well defined this as such in this connection with this problem—you do not do one-tenth of 1 percent of the work that is done in private enterprise for the same general purpose, do you?

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir. They have to satisfy the general consumer.

Mr. WHITTEN. I say that in their overall operation, they are much, much larger than you are in yours, and to a great degree, you take up where they leave off, because of specialized needs you may have in the services.

How much of that work in this particular area do you do with civil service or regular military personnel, and how much of it do you do by contract?

Colonel PENNINGTON. Fifty-one percent.

General SEEMAN. Fifty-one and forty-nine percent; about 50–50.

Mr. WHITTEN. Do you have your contracting force as well as your operating force in Chicago?

Colonel PENNINGTON. No, sir; the contracting force is located in Natick.

Mr. WHITTEN. Was that carried in Natick when you first started?

General SEEMAN. It was carried to Natick from out of Washington. It was centralized out of Washington, Jeffersonville, and the other points Colonel Pennington mentioned.

Mr. WHITTEN. The actual letting of contracts is at Natick?

Colonel PENNINGTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. This is a form of writing agreements and directives. The planning that goes on behind that contract is done by the folks who work with the problem and they are in Chicago; is that correct?

Colonel PENNINGTON. Partly, yes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Where are the rest of them?

General SEEMAN. It might come out of the coordination done by the Research and Development, Army, staff. The Quartermaster does some for the other services. It might come from the top down. They have to get together sometime.

PROPER OPERATION OF CHICAGO FACILITIES

Mr. WHITTEN. If the committee were to refuse to go along with this, or the Congress were to refuse to go along with this matter—now that it has been pointed out to you how you operate this building—do you contemplate going to the GSA and seeing if they want to pay the proper cost of the operation? Do you contemplate renting this other space to the Post Office? Do you contemplate raising their rent in line with what they pay elsewhere in the event you do not get this money? Are you going to run that building on a proper basis?

General SEEMAN. Even if we were successful in receiving the approval to go ahead with this work this year, it would take perhaps 18 months, as you know, to get a structure, and a roof ready to accommodate people. We would still have the problem of trying to run it to get a return, and run it as efficiently as we possibly can. If this is disapproved, we will continue to——

Mr. WHITTEN. Continue what? That is what I am trying to find out.

Continue to try to talk with anybody, or take it up with them, or start over again and start making this thing take care of itself?

General SEEMAN. I do not believe we have talked to anybody formally yet, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am just taking your own answer, General. I am not going to take issue with you.

Colonel PENNINGTON. We have made four studies. The record is not quite correct that we have not contacted anyone on the Chicago facility. Four studies have been made in the past years—1953, 1955, 1956, and 1958. These studies were made by; the Chicago engineers to locate additional tenants for the building.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pardon me, do the Army Engineers want the space or not?

General SEEMAN. The Army Engineers made these studies for us, this determination. The District engineer made a survey for additional tenants.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Army Engineers did not indicate they were requesting space within the building?

Colonel PENNINGTON. No, sir.

General SEEMAN. May I interrupt here?

You have information which has just come out within the last few weeks that GSA has discontinued a contract with the Merchandise Mart Building and requires space to accommodate an engineer's office for an interim period. This was not part of that study but just to get our timing in proper focus.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Go ahead.

Colonel PENNINGTON. That completes my statement.

Mr. WHITTEN. Does it show anything there about contacting the Post Office Department?

Colonel PENNINGTON. No, sir; it does not. Those were both engineer organizations—the Chicago engineering district and division, and the ordnance district—those three specifically.

Mr. WHITTEN. In other words, you just reviewed this for the Army primarily?

General SEEMAN. Within the Army responsibility.

Colonel PENNINGTON. Yet we have had an additional increase of post office space over the years. They have added some 50,000 feet over additional space we gave them—the additional requests of what they wanted.

Mr. WHITTEN. You mean the additional space or charges?

Colonel PENNINGTON. Space.

Mr. WHITTEN. I know that there are arguments between the various departments of the Government as to who is going to finally be charged with the costs. What those appropriations come out of is quite frequently a little more competitive than private business, but their own records show our staff that they are paying a dollar for space elsewhere and paying you 40 cents. It certainly strikes me that they need additional space and it looks like someone has kind of let this thing drag so as to build up support for the move. The present state of the record does not show me a single change from the day you started to concentrate in Natick and decided for reasons of your own to keep this in Chicago.

You understand, I am speaking for myself. I do not find a single thing to support this except the changing desire. Apparently you could do a much better job with the building.

Who is in charge of the maintenance and handling and dealing with the rent at Chicago? Who is the individual in charge?

General SEEMAN. The Quartermaster General.

Mr. WHITTEN. Who is in charge of it in Chicago?

Colonel PENNINGTON. Commanding officer is Colonel Mansager.

Mr. WHITTEN. Have you complained about this uneconomic operation of the building? Has he had any black marks against his record or has he been cautioned about it? Has anything of that sort been done?

Colonel PENNINGTON. We have discussed this with them. I do not think the control rests finally with Colonel Mansager in the administration of actually going out and leasing the space.

Mr. WHITTEN. Who has the responsibility of operating this on a proper basis? If this were an Army base someone would have the job of running it properly. This happens to be a building. Does anybody have the responsibility of handling it properly and getting a maximum return?

General SEEMAN. The Quartermaster General, similar to a tactical base.

Mr. WHITTEN. Colonel Mansager is the commanding officer?

Colonel PENNINGTON. Yes, sir.

ANIMAL LABORATORY

Mr. WHITTEN. You are going to build the animal laboratory 12 or 14 miles from the main operation. Our report tells us that your contract provides for proper care, maintenance, cleanliness, and so on.

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. What is wrong with the present operation insofar as your need for pigs is concerned?

Colonel PENNINGTON. The facility we have now is not satisfactory for the type of work we are doing. We do not have the control. We bring these animals in in a trailer-type operation. After exposure, if they are still salable, we return them to the farmer who has furnished them. If not, they are destroyed. This is not a satisfactory operation where we can control or properly house them. We require a facility for proper control of animal experimentation we are doing. We do not have that at the present time.

Mr. WHITTEN. At Natick what is it you do with pigs?

Dr. RICE. It is in connection with our work on protection of the individual soldier. For burns, there is no substitute for the pigs' skins in this work we are doing.

Mr. WHITTEN. Is that a new work since you moved to Natick or did you do that kind of work before?

Dr. RICE. It was never done at Chicago.

Mr. WHITTEN. How long have you been carrying on that work at Natick?

Dr. RICE. As long as I can remember.

Mr. WHITTEN. During that period you have not felt the necessity for a laboratory at Natick. You request it only when you will move the operation from Chicago. Is that correct? You have been carrying on this work at Natick for all these years and never needed a laboratory until you got ready to leave Chicago. Why is that?

Dr. RICE. Research is a progressive thing.

Mr. WHITTEN. So is Natick, evidently. We put everything that was needed there and left the rest of the operation in Chicago.

Dr. RICE. So far we have attempted to get along by having a contractor bringing in the animals. They are used. As far as scientists are able they evaluate the results and the animals go back to the contractor. It is a short-term affair. It is the only type of experimentation we do, stuff that requires not more than a day, because there is no place to keep them.

In order to do a good job we need to keep them longer. To do that we need facilities.

Mr. WHITTEN. You feel you need facilities of that kind whether you move or not.

Dr. RICE. That is right.

Mr. WHITTEN. This is for burns. What is the general nature of what you do with the pigs in addition to the one example you have given me at Natick?

Dr. RICE. Specifically for pigs?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes.

Dr. RICE. I would rather mention animals. We use the animal depending on what we are testing. We have a lot of work going on with the effect of stress.

We have work also on general protection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Have you ever requested from the Department of the Defense funds for the building of the laboratory prior to this move?

Dr. RICE. I believe so.

Colonel PENNINGTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. You say in your justification that these animals are kept in an unventilated area in a warehouse. Our check shows you have almost 2,000 square feet air conditioned. You have rats, mice, guinea pigs, and dogs.

Our folks go out there and they tell us you have not had a pig in a year and a half.

General SEEMAN. I did not hear the word "pig" until we got to Natick, Mr. Whitten. The word was "animals" in Chicago. Two thousand square feet air conditioned is about a 50 by 40 room so it is not a large air-conditioned area.

Dr. RICE. We have used a guinea pig in work on food.

Mr. WHITTEN. I speak of Chicago. They do list those in the report.

Going a little further we come to the effort of contacting the Natick Board of Health.

Our folks say from contacting the board of health that you have not contacted them.

Other officials tell our people that if the Institute were moved to Natick you anticipate traveltime would increase by one-third and there would be an increase of one-third in personnel.

Dr. RICE. I don't like your having the impression we have not contacted the board of health. I am sure they have been contacted. It may have been on an informal basis but I have seen a letter from our commanding general at Natick in which he answers the questions you have posed.

Mr. WHITTEN. My statement includes the conclusions given us in the report. I do not vouch for them any more than you vouch for the justifications which come up through channels, but by raising these issues it brings up the question of which is correct.

Dr. RICE. I didn't want you to feel we have been negligent.

General SEEMAN. I do not want to impugn the honesty or integrity of any individual. In the final analysis you have to talk to the man responsible.

I do not doubt but what the contacts were made by responsible people but we have to get them together.

Dr. RICE. And it may have been on an informal basis.

Mr. WHITTEN. Inasmuch as I can ascertain the name of the individual contacted it seems to have been with the Department of Health and not with the service. That is the conclusion you draw. I do not say that is a fact. They could have been contacted after this report.

I can understand that if you have pigs and animals in an area, and it is apparent everybody else has them, that somebody might take it that it was not necessary to ask for additional ones.

General SEEMAN. Yes, sir.

SOURCE OF TECHNICAL PERSONNEL

Mr. WHITTEN. This report further states:

The food industry has estimated there will be only 200 students throughout the country obtaining degrees in food technology to fill about 700 vacancies in the industry. Most of those obtaining such degrees will be from schools in the Chicago area because these schools specialize in such training.

Presumably that was the basis for your putting the operation in Chicago in the first place and leaving it there when you drew your plans for Natick.

Dr. RICE. MIT and Rutgers would take a dim view of a statement like that.

Mr. WHITTEN. Colleges are competitive, just as doctors are. It depends on who you talk to.

I take a lot of pride in my school but other folks have the same thing in their schools. I am merely quoting statements made in the report.

NEED FOR PROPER COST COMPARISON

The point is made further that there is little family housing available at the post at Natick. Natick officials, however, state that there is extensive new housing construction.

All the way through here this report raises serious questions as to planning and lack of survey. This makes me wonder if further survey should not be made by you prior to any definite move.

Certainly I think you would want to review your justifications, General, in which you show the amount of savings there would be if we in turn set up this present operation on a proper income basis.

The point further is made in this report to us that if you make a proper allocation between the various operations that you would have in Natick instead of amortizing the cost of the change in some 2 or 3 years it would actually take 46¼ years. That is a tremendous difference.

General SEEMAN. It is true there is an evaluation of this in relation to the Food and Container Institute principally; being the primary tenant now, causes such a comparison. There is also the effect on the Army as a whole; this is the problem we are faced with.

Mr. Chairman, I would not want to leave the record where it might be construed as critical of the Department of Defense in this agreement with regard to the 35 cents or 40 cents intergovernmental transfer of funds for reimbursement of space.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You do not have to leave the Department in that category. The record speaks for itself.

General SEEMAN. There are many depots and warehouses where we have mobilization or long-range needs which justify keeping them inactive. This is merely a means of sharing.

Mr. WHITTEN. When I speak of the Department of Defense or the Army I speak of it in the broad sense. I find most of the individuals I know, work as hard as I do and do as well as they can.

I am not talking about you but the overall system.

Perhaps there is a basis for this swing around to a 33⅓ percent basis. That is what 35 cents would be against one dollar. Perhaps it suits you.

But when you in turn come in and point out there is a 65 cents loss to justify this, that is where I think you are stretching the rope a little bit.

Colonel FLANDERS. The average cost of supporting the Chicago administrative setup is approximately $1 a square foot. The Post Office Department is paying us 35 cents a square foot. This is not unreasonable—40 cents if I may correct myself. This is not unreasonable when you consider the use to which they are putting their space. They are using it primarily as storage. We are using space in that building for laboratory purposes. This is tremendously more costly to support than storage space.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That does not deviate from the basic price the Post Office is paying. You may be utilizing one-half of that for a mint which costs you $1,000, but that does not change the space here which you are not using for the mint.

In operating throughout the country this is set up in accordance with each location. They set their investment in accordance with every location and not a percentage basis. The Post Office Department does not do that, and I know it.

Colonel FLANDERS. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We find the people who set up this particular regulation saying, "We will take it across the board." That was a bad operation as it pertains to cost factors of the U.S. Army. You went down the well for so much money, so you are subsidizing the Post Office between the price you are getting and the general price they are paying even in Chicago.

Colonel FLANDERS. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you want budget money spent that way you are welcome, but under a tight budget you are a little off base in doing it.

Colonel FLANDERS. If I may bring out this point, sir—if we wipe out all regulations and look just at Chicago Administrative Center, and try to allocate the costs proportional to the service performed, we could not charge the Post Office $1 a square foot for the cost we are paying to operate the space they are in.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What could you charge them?

Colonel FLANDERS. Perhaps 50 cents or 60 cents.

Mr. SHEPPARD. So it is 50 cents.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is a funny deal. Let me read you what our people say.

First this is a contract between you and the Post Office Department. I do not know of any obligation that you have to rent on a cost basis. If that were it you would be getting the increased pay, so it is a matter of contract and agreement.

The Post Office officials say that your rate is so low it is phenomenal, since the Post Office Department is paying approximately $1 a square foot for other space in Chicago. They are laughing at you.

Colonel FLANDERS. I am sure that is true, sir, but our information has been that the Post Office would like to get their operations out of that building and consolidate it in the Central Post Office Building where they have no space and which would cost them more.

Mr. WHITTEN. The report states that the Post Office Department is "Definitely interested in obtaining more space at CAC and is requesting 17,000 square feet of additional warehouse space for future Post Office activity. The Post Office authorities advise they consider the building facility at CAC as being most desirable and they have given no consideration to moving away from that location."

When we read that and match it against your statement——

General SEEMAN. This is the basis of my comment. I only hope we can follow these things out and find out who are the responsible people making these statements because I have not heard this before.

I have no desire to impugn anybody's integrity. We have been trying for years to utilize the space. If we could have sold any more, just as Amos said to Andy, it is only the volume that keeps us in business.

This is just a new factor.

Mr. WHITTEN. Every statement the colonel has made seems to point out that you have been holding hands with each other in that there is no evidence here from anybody that you have contacted a single person. You haven't the least bit of evidence to show that the quartermaster general or colonel whatever-his-name-is has so much as contacted any of your renters, which led me to ask if you were letting this go down so as to justify the removal.

If you have evidence to show otherwise, go ahead.

General SEEMAN. We are being completely honest.

Mr. WHITTEN. I know you are.

General SEEMAN. This situation in the building has been known over a succession of 8 years and everybody in the Chicago area, including GSA, has known of the availability of space there.

They have progressively come along and taken additional space in the building; that is, the Post Office Department, which is a dead storage, mail bag operation. This is generally so well known that the idea of going and twisting anybody's arm for an additional space use probably did not occur. It has been so well known, sir, that we have been trying to overcome the situation.

Colonel PENNINGTON. We did contact the tenants, sir, for additional space. There were studies made in 1953, 1955, 1956, and 1958 by the Chicago District Engineers.

General SEEMAN. It is true that primarily our contacts would be Army tenants.

Mr. WHITTEN. I understand that.

General SEEMAN. Other Government people would have to contact GSA.

Mr. WHITTEN. Those people you contacted were other branches of the military.

Colonel PENNINGTON. Also it indicates tenants, also, were contacted, those tenants already in the building, which would include the Post Office.

General SEEMAN. At one time there was an out-lease to a civilian operation.

Mr. WHITTEN. Do you have any separate setup in this operation? Is this building operated as it would be if it were an office building with a record kept on all this? Is this carried on your books where the building is computed separately for amortization, and so on, or do you just rent what you can and then use your own space without charge? Is the latter about the way it operates?

General SEEMAN. That is correct, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I will just say for the record, again, that I do not see any change in the overall situation out there from what existed when the plans were initially made and it was determined that this particular operation should be at Chicago. Since the record shows no change other than the operation of this building it leaves me unconvinced.

I will be glad to hear anything further, speaking only as an individual.

That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Perhaps this may be in evidence, I am not sure.

You say the quartermaster general is responsible. All right. The quartermaster general is like the chief of any other bureau. He is responsible on the premise that information is fed to him from his various commands.

I do not know at the moment what the regulatory requirements are in the Chicago operation, whether he is to be there merely to see that maintenance and things of that character are provided for the tenants or whether he is charged with the direct responsibility of seeing that that building is kept filled by tenants. I do not know about that.

If this man is charged with that responsibility, then, very frankly, under the existing circumstances, as the reports indicate, somewhere along the line somebody just has not functioned properly.

Either the postmaster's office is giving us bad information or the Army is giving us bad information. There is no middle ground. The report speaks for itself.

The men who make these reports do a good job. Whether the facts they were given are correct or not is another story. I have no way of telling unless we get to a point where we get to a showdown.

Mr. WHITTEN. Money is collected from rents by the Army. Are they turned in as general receipts of the Treasury or do they go into a revolving fund?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would assume they are turned in to the Treasury. Is that correct?

General SEEMAN. Credited to general funds of the Treasury.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The limitations of those operating that particular property would spell out more or less the idiosyncracies we have been discussing here practically all afternoon.

Very frankly, gentlemen, there is a wide difference between the Post Office, GSA, and the Army. That is evident.

NATURE OF RESEARCH WORK

Mr. JONAS. Do you do this research and study for the other services or is this solely Army?

General SEEMAN. Primarily a Quartermaster Corps responsibility. On subsistence it has the single-manager responsibility.

Colonel PENNINGTON. In clothing and textiles it is the same.

Mr. JONAS. You do that for all the services?

Colonel PENNINGTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. There is no duplication in that field?

Colonel PENNINGTON. Not that I know of.

Mr. JONAS. Neither of the other services is engaged in testing clothing, containers, and food packaging?

General SEEMAN. This is the responsibility of the Quartermaster Corps for all the services.

Mr. JONAS. What is the phase of the operation that is exclusively for the Army? Is it animal testing?

Colonel PENNINGTON. I didn't understand the question.

Mr. JONAS. What is the function carried on which is exclusively for the Army?

General SEEMAN. I do not think we can add anything more to page 63 of our project justification. The first element is basic research in food nutrition, stability, and acceptance.

Second is design, improvement, and evaluation of military rations and food products.

Third, the container development mission.

Fourth, the research and development on radiation processes.

Mr. JONAS. My question is how many of those activities are duplicated in the other services?

Colonel PENNINGTON. I know of none.

Mr. JONAS. You mean the Navy is carrying on its antarctic operation without work in this field?

Dr. RICE. In some cases we will cooperate and they will do a portion of it.

Mr. JONAS. Where do they make their tests to determine items needed and the effect of antarctic conditions on the human body?

General SEEMAN. Sir, you are getting into the medical research and development where we had this discussion of the Fort Knox Medical Laboratory.

Mr. JONAS. On page 69, in the second paragraph, you say considerable emphasis has been placed on arctic operations, which would indicate that is one of the missions.

General SEEMAN. With regard to the exposure of personnel with regard to their clothing, and with regard to the adequacy of the rations, nutrition, and so on human body tolerance is something else.

Mr. JONAS. You could not have any more adverse conditions than those existing in the Antarctic, can you?

General SEEMAN. That is correct. I can speak with knowledge regarding the engineering equipment where certain engineer equipment, which was furnished for the Navy, resulted from Army Engineer experience in development of equipment which would work in various climates.

Mr. JONAS. You have operated in the Arctic and Antarctic a long time. It would seem to me you have all the information you can get on that subject.

General SEEMAN. As a taxpayer I would like to say we have, but as a scientific individual there seem always to be new horizons and things you have to get to the bottom of.

Mr. JONAS. Why cannot some of this work be done in the Cold Regions Laboratory?

General SEEMAN. That, again, is over the line into the development of knowledge on permafrost, foundations, and construction material as opposed to the human nutrition and human clothing.

Undoubtedly those cold chambers will test a can of cornbeef just as a quart of motor oil, for example. There the decision is made on the cost of transportation and your people back and forth.

Mr. JONAS. What is there that is so peculiar about packaging Army food which would require this kind of scientific endeavor on the part of the Army that is not available elsewhere? I can understand the need to test subsistence items which may not be salable in the civilian market, but I cannot see much need to conduct extensive tests in the container field.

Colonel PENNINGTON. High altitude feeding containers is one problem.

On the clothing we have the climatic labs where we test the types of clothing either for hot weather climates or cold weather climates located at Natick. We run our field tests primarily at Fort Churchill, when we actually take out the item and test it.

Mr. JONAS. You mean test items that you procure to see if they are standard?

Colonel PENNINGTON. Also developing the types of containers we will require for the special type of feeding I am talking about.

Mr. JONAS. Are there any parts of the world where we have not already been in operation? Do we not already know what we need to know in this field?

Colonel PENNINGTON. Apparently not, sir.

Mr. JONAS. Who makes that decision?

General SEEMAN. What we know so often develops into what we do not know and what we would like to have in case we had to go back and things like that.

Colonel Pennington mentioned the most exotic item before us at the present time, high altitude feeding, but the straightforward military requirements of rations is important. There is not a civilian requirement, although some of our freight handling sometimes indicates it, for the containers dropping from aircraft; containers and methods of preservation to take care of storage for 30 to 60 days, where we have to maintain it for 60 days or 90 days, for example, backup storage in Europe for combat. Supermarket containers must attract the housewives. They want to turn over their stock more frequently.

We have a problem of preservation which is a little bit different.

Mr. JONAS. This, then, would be a continuing problem?

General SEEMAN. A new element always comes in. Plastic containers come in. Can we save steel, aluminum, and so on?

Mr. JONAS. You say you contract out 51 percent of this research.

Colonel PENNINGTON. Forty-nine percent.

Mr. JONAS. Why can you not contract out the 51 percent?

Colonel PENNINGTON. Generally, industry has not indicated a desire to work in those fields where they have no commercial outlet. These are primarily for Army requirements. They have not indicated an interest in taking that type of work.

Mr. JONAS. What items are contained in the 49 percent?

Dr. RICE. We decide as far as we can, for example on combat rations, something as light as possible, something which has sufficient nutrient, to last a certain length of time.

The second stage then is to sit down with our technical people, find out what they know of how to the Army operates and design something as closely as possible to what the final product should be.

Then the industrial contractors take over in places where it is recognized they have specific capability in producting one portion of the final item. We retain the Army viewpoint.

Mr. JONAS. You stated on page 66 of the justification as follows:

The recent decision to suspend construction of a pilot production plant for radiation preservation of foods at Sharpe General Depot will have no impact on the requirement for Food and Container Institute facilities for continued research and development of food irradiation preservation processes.

General SEEMAN. This refers to the research and development activity where there has been a development program to put an atomic reactor in California, and then there arose a question as to whether or not we had enough knowledge of the irradiation process that it could be guaranteed to be not harmful to individuals.

Mr. JONAS. I thought that was one of the things you were planning to do at this new laboratory.

General SEEMAN. We are continuing the irradiation program. Whether this will be built at all is up for study.

Mr. JONAS. You are not planning to do any of the things you programed for Sharpe?

General SEEMAN. Sharpe in California?

Mr. JONAS. Yes.

General SEEMAN. If the program goes ahead and they determine that it is necessary then they will have to select the most appropriate place.

Mr. JONAS. How far did we proceed with that pilot plant?

General SEEMAN. No actual construction. It is just planning.

Colonel PENNINGTON. That also was in connection with production at Sharpe, producing the item. The research still will go on but as to actually producing the item, that is a study referred to a moment ago when Mr. Whitten indicated we had made studies. That is the one study that we are now undertaking. That is the only study in connection with this particular move that I know of. It is not associated primarily with the move.

Colonel FLANDERS. This study pertains to expansion of current research in this area; and determination as to where it shall be located. The research construction requested at Natick in this fiscal year 1961 request does not provide for this expansion.

Mr. JONAS. How far will it be from the building we previously referred to?

Colonel PENNINGTON. Adjacent to each other, just a matter of feet.

General SEEMAN. Just the animal laboratory will be 12 miles.

Mr. JONAS. That is all I have.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

General SEEMAN. Thank you for your courtesy, sir.

U.S. ARMY SIGNAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY, FORT MONMOUTH, N.J.

REPORT OF SURVEYS AND INVESTIGATIONS STAFF, MARCH 1960

CONTENTS

I. Introduction.
II. Background and mission.
III. Analysis of proposed addition to hexagon
IV. Need for addition to hexagon.
A. Approval of one building in three increments.
B. Nature of space
1. The Hexagon.
2. The Evans area.
3. The Coles area
C. Reasons for completing the Hexagon at the present time.
1. Increased workload.
2. Quality of space.
3. Resultant savings.
4. Reduction of security risk.
D. Reasons for not completing the Hexagon at the present time.
V. Reasonableness of cost estimate.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Army Signal Corps is seeking authorization and appropriation in fiscal year 1961 of $7,971,000 (revised during course of this study to $7,171,000) for the construction of the third and final increment to its Research and Development Laboratory at Fort Monmouth, N.J. The original amount requested is included in the figure of $9,603,000 for Signal Corps construction at Fort Monmouth as reflected in the military construction authorization bill introduced February 29, 1960 (H.R. 10777, 86th Cong., 2d sess.). This proposed construction, comprised of 284,350 square feet (revised during course of this study to 290,864 square feet), would complete a building designed hexagonally (hereinafter called the Hexagon) and would be used to house research and development facilities and personnel presently located elsewhere in the Fort Monmouth area.

The staff was requested to ascertain whether the additional space represented by the proposed construction was needed and whether the cost estimates were valid and reasonable for minimum construction standards.

The foregoing was accomplished by—

(1) Interviews and examination of available pertinent records at the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) and Department of the Army and

(2) Field visits to Fort Monmouth, N.J., including Research and Development Laboratory facilities at the Hexagon and the Evans area, as well as the U.S. Army Signal Equipment Support Agency (SESA) in the Coles area, and to the New York district office, Corps of Engineers.

II. BACKGROUND AND MISSION

A laboratory was established at Fort Monmouth, N.J., by the Army in 1934. This evolved into what is presently the U.S. Army Signal Research and Development Laboratory (USASRDL), a per-

manent installation. This is the Army's only laboratory for basic research in communications and electronics. In addition to other projects, work is carried on in the areas of radar, countermeasures, physical sciences, and solid state devices (components, materials, and power sources).

The scope of the USASRDL's mission has more than tripled during the period from fiscal year 1951 when $68,870,000 was programed to fiscal year 1961 when it is anticipated $211 million will be needed to carry out the work.

Army facilities for field testing and development of electronic and communication equipment under combat conditions are located at Fort Huachuca, Ariz. USASRDL officials emphasized that the activities at Fort Huachuca do not duplicate the research and development at Fort Monmouth. Although certain personnel were transferred from Fort Monmouth to Fort Huachuca at the time the latter installation was activated in the testing and development field, no USASRDL missions were transferred.

A substantial portion of the Laboratory's research and development proceeds through the medium of contracts. The Laboratory under military direction presently employs approximately 3,500 people most of whom are civilians. During World War II this installation utilized 14,800 employees. Most of the USASRDL's facilities and employees are located either at the Hexagon or the Evans area.

The consolidation of all research and development facilities into one building at Fort Monmouth has been under active consideration since 1948. During fiscal years 1948–51 the Signal Corps programed for one building at an estimated cost of $22 million for the USASRDL. Each year it was refused by the Signal Corps budget review groups. Accordingly, it was decided to do the construction in increments. The first increment of $6,250,000 was authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 1952. The second increment of $7.5 million was authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 1953. Work on both of these increments was substantially completed and the building was occupied in 1955. Certain site-improvement work financed from first increment funds was completed in 1957.

The Hexagon is located on Government-owned property at the corner of Corregidor Road and Pearl Harbor Avenue in the Fort Monmouth complex. It is approximately 9 miles from the Evans area, 2.5 miles from the Coles area, and 3 miles from the post headquarters. The relative positions of these areas are shown by the map on page 4.

The partially completed Hexagon, as it now stands, is a four-story concrete block building, which has been designed with emphasis on interior flexibility. A photograph of the present buildings is on page 5.

A drawing of the building with the third increment sketched in is shown on page 6.

III. Analysis of Proposed Addition to Hexagon

In its request for military construction authorization and appropriation for 1961 the Army included an item of $7,971,000 for com-

pleting the Hexagon. This was covered by a construction item justification data form dated February 1, 1960.

The justification described the proposed structure to be steel with masonry walls. Footings are to be precast concrete piles for the east end and spread reinforced concrete for the remainder. The ground floor is to be concrete on grade, and the balance steel deck with concrete fill. Interior partitions are to be masonry block and movable cement-asbestos and wood. Ceilings are to be suspended with vermiculite plaster as fire proofing. Heating is to be low-pressure steam from the existing plant. Representatives of the district Engineers advised that the design and standards of construction of the third increment with only a few minor adjustments will be identical to those of the first two increments.

The proposed construction will complete enclosing the Hexagon. It includes work on three sides with an exterior length of 810 lineal feet and a width of 100 lineal feet. It involves a gross area of 284,350 square feet at a stated unit cost of $25.85 per square foot for the building only.

The construction item justification data form of February 1, 1960, and related information provided to the Bureau of the Budget in response to a request from that agency dated December 10, 1959 (hereinafter both documents will be referred to as the "justification"), suggest that the permanent space deficiency requirement was arrived at in the following manner:

Total square feet required	1,226,810
Less existing square feet	942,460
Square feet requested in 3d increment	284,350

In attempting to eliminate temporary facilities and to justify the need for the third increment, the Signal Corps set forth in the justification the following realinement of space in the Fort Monmouth complex:

Space occupied by USASRDL and SESA

[Square feet]

	Permanent	Semi-permanent	Temporary	Total
At present:				
Evans area	234,000	124,000	85,000	443,000
Coles area (SESA)			140,000	140,000
Hexagon	828,000			828,000
Total	1,062,000	124,000	225,000	1,411,000
Proposed:				
Evans area [1]	234,000			234,000
Coles area				
Hexagon	1,112,000			1,112,000
Total	1,346,000			1,346,000

[1] USASRDL, 114,000 square feet; SESA, 120,000 square feet.

Under this plan it is proposed to move the bulk of USASRDL facilities and employees from the Evans area to the Hexagon. The USASRDL would retain 114,000 square feet of permanent-type structures in the Evans area which would be manned by approximately 200 employees. The balance (120,000 square feet) of the permanent-type structures in the Evans area would be utilized by SESA which would

vacate 140,000 square feet in the Coles area. The Coles area would be declared excess to the needs of the Signal Corps. In addition, the semipermanent and temporary buildings at the Evans area would be disposed of as uneconomical to maintain and operate.

The staff noted a number of discrepancies in the figures relating to space furnished by the Signal Corps in the justification set out above.

This justification indicates that 828,000 square feet of the Hexagon have been completed. Figures supplied by the district engineer reveal that the present Hexagon is comprised of 665,000 square feet, of which 206,000 square feet were completed in the first increment and 459,000 square feet were completed in the second increment. Thus, the justification overstates the existing square footage of this building by 163,000 square feet.

The foregoing table discloses that the USASRDL presently occupies 443,000 square feet of space of all classifications in the Evans area.

Under date of March 1, 1960, the staff was provided with a list of the Evans area buildings which disclosed total space of 485,673 square feet. Therefore, it appears that the space currently occupied by the USASRDL in the Evans area is understated by 42,673 square feet. The justification understates the square feet of permanent, semipermanent and temporary space in the amounts of 25,164, 7,648, and 9,861 square feet, respectively.

The justification sets forth that 114,000 square feet of permanent space in the Evans area will be retained by the USASRDL. It is to be noted that 46,000 square feet (or 40.3 percent of the 114,000) are for the use of the post engineer. When questioned by the staff as to the specific use to be made of these buildings, the post engineer advised that he had "no idea now" as to the manner in which these buildings will be used to support the USASRDL.

The district engineers in their drawings and working estimates indicated that a total of 284,350 square feet were necessary to complete the Hexagon. This is the exact number of square feet shown on the justification as the quantity of permanent units deficient in USASRDL facilities (after the proposed realinement of space).

Inasmuch as there appears to be an error of 163,000 square feet in the existing units, as discussed previously, it is apparent to the staff that either (1) the total requirement of 1,226,810 square feet is incorrect, or (2) the deficiency of 284,350 square feet is incorrect. In any event the justification as to square feet needed is inaccurate.

This error was pointed out to a representative of the Signal Corps who, after study, advised that the Signal Corps erred by 163,000 square feet in stating the present area of the Hexagon. He had also been informed of the staff's discovery of an error of 6.514 square feet in the district engineer's computation of that area embraced in the third increment. A revised figure of 290,864 square feet and its determination will be discussed under the heading "Reasonableness of Cost Estimate." The Signal Corps representative also advised that the total units of permanent space required should not be 1,226,810 square feet as set forth in the justification but instead should be 1,114,668 square feet arrived at as follows:

Present inventory:	*Permanent square feet*
Hexagon	665, 000
Evans area	114, 000
Fort Monmouth proper	44, 804
Total existing square feet	823, 804
Required to complete the Hexagon	290, 864
Total units required by USASRDL	1, 114, 668

From the foregoing it appears that the square feet in permanent space required by the USASRDL was not ascertained from a careful analysis of laboratory needs, but instead has been an exercise in arithmetic working from the square feet necessary to complete the Hexagon.

A Signal Corps official advised that the laboratory buildings comprising the 44,804 square feet at Fort Monmouth proper are not permanent-type structures. He stated they are included as "permanent" because there is no plan to vacate these buildings. It is noted that during the staff's visit to Fort Monmouth when USASRDL officials were requested to itemize their available space no mention was made of this 44,804 square feet.

The commanding officer of USASRDL advised that though there is need for improved quality of space, there is no need for an additional quantity of space. The following table sets forth the present space occupied by the USASRDL and the deficiency of square feet after the contemplated realinement of space:

	Square feet
Presently occupied at Evans area	485, 673
Presently occupied in Hexagon	665, 000
Total presently occupied (total requirement)	1, 150, 673
To be occupied at Evans area	114, 000
Presently occupied in Hexagon	665, 000
Deficiency	[1] 371, 673
Units required	1, 150, 673

[1] After the third increment of 290,864 square feet there would remain a space deficiency of 80,809 square feet. Accordingly, even with the additional permanent space provided by the third increment it would appear necessary to continue use of 80,809 square feet of the total 131,648 square feet of semipermanent space in the Evans area.

A responsible official of SESA located at the Coles area advised that the SESA activity presently requires 150,000 square feet of space and some additional space would be desirable. It is noted that the justification indicates the SESA operation is persently utilizing 140,000 square feet and will be moved into 120,000 square feet at the Evans area. This would suggest that the total activity of SESA would overflow into the semipermanent or temporary buildings at the Evans area which the justification states "* * * are to be disposed of as uneconomical to maintain and operate."

IV. Need for Addition to Hexagon

A. APPROVAL OF ONE BUILDING IN THREE INCREMENTS

Review of the legislative history of this project to build a consolidated laboratory at Fort Monmouth reveals that at the time the first and second increments were considered and approved by the House Appropriations Committee in connection with fiscal year 1952 and fiscal year 1953 military construction programs the committee was apprised of the fact that three increments were contemplated to complete the building and that the total estimated cost of the completed building would be approximately $22 million. The budget justification submitted for the first increment in June 1951 stated that the Laboratory would be so designed that, as the present temporary structures deteriorate beyond the point of economical maintenance, additions may be added.

Inasmuch as the first two increments were approved by Congress with the knowledge that eventually a third increment would be necessary to house all research and development activities in the Fort Monmouth area as present facilities become deteriorated, the staff did not make a complete review of the possibility of relocating a portion of the Laboratory in surplus Government-owned buildings elsewhere in the country, of the merits of combining certain of the USASRDL activities with similar activities in the Navy and Air Force, or of contracting additional research work. Instead, the staff concentrated on the timeliness of the proposed construction.

B. NATURE OF SPACE

The USASRDL presently utilizes space at the Hexagon and in the Evans area where it occupies many buildings. It also conducts tests in other outlying areas.

1. THE HEXAGON

The staff visited the Hexagon and observed that space was being used as a technical laboratory where scientists and technicians were conducting experiments; as technical offices; as technical support; as shops to make equipment; as general or administrative offices and for utilities and general use. The staff noted that although with minor exceptions the Hexagon was fully occupied, there did not appear to be any areas of congestion.

Approximately 50 percent of the cafeteria built to serve the entire Hexagon Building is being used for office space and classrooms. This space is separated from the cafeteria by temporary partitions.

Various responsible officials interviewed by the staff advised that their space is fully adequate and they are not overcrowded. In many instances it was noted that even though large areas were occupied by laboratory equipment there were relatively few employees needed to handle the equipment. Representatives of the Laboratory advised that square footage of laboratory space cannot be equated with the number of employees.

During the visit to the Hexagon the staff noted no evidence of extravagant construction. Moreover, it appeared to be more austere than plush. In this regard, it should be pointed out that the walls are of cinder-block construction.

The commanding officer of the USASRDL advised that the Hexagon had been very carefully planned. He said that when the building is completed it will be comparable to any other modern laboratory in the country. He cited as examples the large amount of space for utilities between floors and the easily movable partitions within the building.

An inconvenience in the Hexagon as it now stands in the considerable walking distance from the extremity of one side of the building to the opposite end. Inasmuch as the completed portion of the Hexagon roughly represents an arc, it is readily apparent that upon completion of the building the distance between these points will be considerably reduced. Another inconvenience is the lack of sufficient elevator facilities. The Hexagon as it now stands has one passenger and one freight elevator. The staff was advised that the two passenger elevators and one freight elevator planned for the third increment would relieve the present elevator congestion. In this regard, however, it should be noted that the Fort Monmouth post engineer indicated that plans are underway to build two elevators in the present structure regardless of whether the third increment is completed. This will tend to eliminate the inconvenience caused by the lack of elevators.

The Hexagon as it now stands is not air conditioned except in certain special areas. In the estimate for budget purposes prepared by the New York district engineers on December 14, 1959, ventilating and air conditioning are provided for 98,250 square feet of the third increment. The staff was advised that this air conditioning is for special areas.

In addition, this estimate provided as an additive item for $4,237,000 for complete air conditioning of increments 1 and 2 and the balance of the third increment. In the justification of February 1, 1960, however, this additive item has been deleted. The staff was advised the military regulations permit air conditioning for individual comfort in this section of New Jersey. A representative of the post engineer's office advised that the Hexagon would be air conditioned regardless of whether it was approved for the third increment. This is being pointed out as it may increase the ultimate cost of the completed Hexagon by more than $4 million.

The staff observed that there is a temporary (bituminous-surfaced) parking area (No. 2) located where the third increment is planned to be built. This along with other site improvements was constructed from first increment funds.

These site improvements consisted of grading, drainage, and permanent paving of parking lot No. 1; grading, drainage and temporary paving of parking lots Nos. 2 and 3; furnishing of center court with roadway and curbs; seeding the center court and the area around the outside of the Hexagon; and the furnishing of outdoor road and parking lot lights. These items were originally planned for the third increment but were accomplished after the completion of the first two increments when it became apparent that funds for the third incre-

ment would be delayed. These improvements cost approximately $439,000. The district engineers stated that about $55,000 of this cost resulted from a premature use of the parking lots by the user agency.

2. THE EVANS AREA

A significant part of the justification dated February 1, 1960, deals with the space now used by the USASRDL in the Evans area. The justification sets forth, in part, the following:

> Present facilities, of temporary mobilization-type structures built in 1942, have outlived their life expectancy. These buildings were not designed to accommodate R. & D. type operations and are unsuitable for the installation of modern R. & D. laboratory equipment now required because of advances in a state of the art and the advances in space technology, in which this laboratory is required to participate. Maintenance and renewal costs to correct these buildings to accommodate modern R. & D. requirements are prohibitive. These can only be maintained on an increasing cost basis. The permanent-type buildings (234,000 square feet at Evans area are one-story structures not designed to accept modern R. & D. laboratory equipment. These buildings require constant, impractical, and costly modifications to accommodate the requirements for a modern R. & D. laboratory. These shell-type structures are not sufficiently flexible to accept the changing requirements of the day-to-day requirements of a modern R. & D. laboratory. No provisions have been made or can be made without excessive costs to provide flexibility in heavy power requirements, interconnections between laboratory equipment and such utilities as gas, compressed air, and water. In some areas, these laboratories require as many as seven to nine different types of gases for their work. The laboratory will retain 114,000 square feet of these permanent shell-type structures that have been adapted to accommodate certain specific phases of the R. & D. mission, i.e., nucleonics, including radiation experiments, Diana radar experiments, etc.

The staff visited the Evans area and inspected a number of buildings of each type used. Photographs of exteriors of buildings classified as permanent and semipermanent will be found on pages 17, 18, and 19. The buildings photographed are typical examples of the structures in the Evans area. The photographs were taken by the Signal Corps during the staff's visit to Fort Monmouth.

Buildings 10 and 11 are of permanent type and consist of a total of 60,858 square feet (30,429 square feet each). The USASRDL plans to retain 15,214 square feet in one of these buildings. According to the justification the remainder of the two buildings would be either (*a*) utilized by USASRDL activities presently located in temporary or semipermanent buildings, or (*b*) turned over to SESA.

Building No. S–39 is a semipermanent building comprised of 16,218 square feet. The entire USASRDL activity in this building will be transferred to a permanent building, and this building will be disposed of according to information provided to the staff under date of March 1, 1960. However, there appears to be uncertainty as to its future use since the staff was advised by a responsible official of the USASRDL that the Laboratory would continue to use building No. S–39.

Building No. S–21 is a semipermanent structure of 4,222 feet. The wooden supports shown in the photograph were included in the original design in order that the building would be metal free. The USASRDL plans to abandon and dispose of this building.

During the inspection of the Evans area the staff requested accompanying USASRDL officials to point out instances where the buildings are improperly designed to accommodate research and development operations, are unsuitable for the installation of modern R. & D. laboratory equipment, and are inadequate for properly carrying out the present research and development activity assigned thereto.

These officials cited two buildings of the foregoing types. There was one instance cited involving two rooms where avionics research and development were being carried out. Although this was pointed out to the staff as inadequate space due to congestion, the staff later learned the avionics research is being moved to space being made available in the existing Hexagon.

They pointed out as another example of inadequate space the structure housing the research on solid state devices. The inadequacy was described as overcrowding of equipment and lack of dust-free air. The photograph on page 19 illustrates the type of structure housing this activity. The staff was advised that no major modernization has been done to this building because it is planned to move this activity into the third increment. The official in charge of this building pointed out that he is in the process of partitioning and dustproofing certain areas as an interim measure.

Examination of the buildings in the Evans area by the staff disclosed them to be well painted, free of leaks, and otherwise in a good state of repair. There were no apparent signs of extensive deterioration. Officials advised the permanent buildings were very well constructed. They were unable to point out instances of substandard structures even though requested specifically to do so, except for dampness in the basement of one permanent-type building. The officials were unable to designate examples of buildings where the maintenance cost is "prohibitive" and where the buildings require "* * * constant, impractical, and costly modifications * * *." It was ascertained that the post engineer for Fort Monmouth does not maintain a separate operation and maintenance cost account or separate records for deferred maintenance for the Evans area.

The post engineer pointed out that more than 3 years ago second floors were installed in buildings of the type such as shown on page 19. Additionally, extensive roofing repairs were made throughout the Evans area. Other than this he could not cite an instance of more than normal repairs.

3. THE COLES AREA

The justification dated February 1, 1960, states that upon completion of the Hexagon and consolidation of laboratory facilities SESA will be moved from the Coles area to vacated space in the Evans area. It states that once this move is accomplished no further need is anticipated for the 40 acres and 140,000 square feet of buildings in the Coles area, consequently it will be declared excess to the needs of the Signal Corps.

The staff visited the Coles area, which is located approximately 2.5 miles from the Hexagon, and inspected the grounds and buildings occupied by SESA.

SESA employs approximately 850 people, all civilian except for 4 staff officers. Inasmuch as a prime responsibility of the agency is to

collaborate with the USASRDL on procurement specifications of newly developed items, these employees must be in relatively close proximity to the USASRDL. Until 1956 the SESA activity was carried out by a division of the USASRDL.

SESA occupies four large buildings in the Coles area and uses several smaller structures for miscellaneous storage. All buildings were built during World War II, are of the temporary type, and do not appear to be in as good condition as those in the Evans area built during the same period. Some deterioration was noted as well as the need for alterations and repairs.

When queried as to the finality of declaring the Coles area as excess to the needs of the Signal Corps and the Army, responsible Fort Monmouth officials advised there would be no requirement for the Coles area "as seen now." One official stated that he would like to see the Coles area retained by SESA and something else moved into the Evans area.

It would appear that by moving to the Evans area SESA would have better facilities. However, such a move would increase (from 2.5 miles to 9 miles) the distance SESA and Hexagon engineers and scientists would have to travel almost daily to establish contact on mutual problems. It should be noted that decreased travel is one of the reasons given by the USASRDL for completing the third increment and moving the major portion of their Evans activities into the Hexagon.

C. REASONS FOR COMPLETING THE HEXAGON AT THE PRESENT TIME

Officials of OSD, Department of the Army, the Signal Corps and USASRDL emphasized that the principal reason for completing the Hexagon at this time is to consolidate as many USASRDL functions as possible into one building in order that engineers and scientists can work in close proximity to one another and thereby establish a team approach to problems. This would in effect create an intellectual atmosphere where ideas could easily be exchanged. This reason was omitted from the justification dated February 1, 1960. In this connection it is well to note the distance from the Hexagon to the Evans area is only 9 miles and requires but 20 minutes driving time between buildings. This only slightly in excess of the scheduled Department of Defense (DOD) bus time from the Pentagon to the main Navy building.

Other reasons cited were:

1. INCREASED WORKLOAD

It is noted from figures supplied by the USASRDL and previously set forth in this report that the workload at USASRDL has more than tripled from 1951 to 1961. No further increase is envisioned in the normal mission of the USASRDL; however, space age requirements and work for the Advanced Research Project Agency (ARPA) and the National Aeronautics and Space Agency (NASA) are expected to increase. USASRDL anticipates $100 million a year from ARPA and NASA for the next 3 years. This represents 46.3 percent, 41.0 percent, and 38.9 percent for each year, respectively, of the total resources expected for each of the years.

From 1951 through 1959 only 20 percent of the Signal Corps funds available to USASRDL were used for inhouse research and development. The balance was for contracted work. In fiscal year 1960 the inhouse work increased to approximately 35 percent and USASRDL expects it to continue at this level through fiscal year 1964.

2. QUALITY OF SPACE

Officials at USASRDL advised that they now have sufficient square footage of building space. However, they stated that in addition to bringing research and development activities together, as discussed above, completion of the third increment would provide a much improved quality of facility. Examples of this, they pointed out, are the readily accessible utility connections, very flexible room partitions and ability to provide special research and test areas. No survey has been made by the USASRDL as to the availability of suitable space elsewhere since USASRDL officials plan to retain all their present activities in the Fort Monmouth complex. The commanding officer of USASRDL advised he prefers the present separation of laboratory activities with its inherent drawbacks to the moving of any portion of the USASRDL to another locale.

In addition, as pointed out above, the completion of the third increment will reduce the distance problem presently existing in the partially completed building. It would appear that the elevator problem will be solved with the construction of the two proposed elevators in the existing structure.

3. RESULTANT SAVINGS

Officials at Fort Monmouth furnished the following figures on estimated annual savings upon completion of the Hexagon:

(*a*) Elimination of Evans area motor pool, $375,000;

(*b*) Elimination of duplicate functions, such as security guards, mailrooms, libraries, receptionists, custodial services, and certain shop overhead, $175,000;

(*c*) Estimated savings of scientific and professional personnel time lost due to travel between Hexagon and Evans area, $50,000; and

(*d*) Savings to be realized from discontinuance of maintenance costs of temporary buildings in Evans and Coles areas which are to be disposed of, $124,644. This is a net figure and takes into consideration additional maintenance and operational costs of the Hexagon resulting from the third increment.

Total estimated savings, $724,644.

With annual savings of the foregoing amount the cost of completing the Hexagon ($7,971,000) would be amortized in approximately 11 years. With the same annual savings the reduced estimate of $7,171,000 would be amortized in about 9.9 years.

With respect to item (*a*) it should be noted there will continue to be substantial transportation costs in connection with SESA and USASRDL units which will remain at the Evans area.

In regard to item (*c*) it should be noted that additional travel time of SESA personnel from the Evans area will somewhat offset this savings.

Regarding item (*d*) it should be noted that in order to accomplish this savings the post engineer has advised that 266,700 square feet of temporary buildings in the Evans area will be demolished. The staff was advised by USASRDL in a letter dated March 1, 1960, that there are only 94,861 square feet of temporary buildings in the Evans area. Temporary and semipermanent buildings in the Evans area total 226,509 square feet, which is 40,191 square feet less than the post engineer says will be demolished.

USASRDL officials estimated moving costs from the Evans area to the Hexagon to range from $150,000 to $270,000 depending on whether the work is done by contract or by the laboratory's own employees. In addition there will be costs in connection with the moving of SESA from the Coles area to the Evans area. Fort Monmouth officials had made no estimates concerning this at the time of the staff's visit.

4. REDUCTION OF SECURITY RISK

USASRDL officials have claimed that the enclosing of the Hexagon will in a purely physical sense provide a means for greatly increased protection of classified equipment and documents with fewer security personnel required.

D. REASONS FOR NOT COMPLETING THE HEXAGON AT THE PRESENT TIME

As pointed out previously in this report the justification for the first increment sets forth that the laboratory was so designed that, as the temporary laboratory structures deteriorate beyond the point of economical maintenance, additions may be made. It would appear from an inspection of the Evans area buildings that they have not substantially deteriorated nor were officials at Fort Monmouth able to show the buildings are excessively uneconomical to maintain.

The justification dated February 1, 1960, supporting the construction of the third increment, indicates that the permanent and temporary buildings in the Evans area are inadequate for research and development work. USASRDL officials could point out only one valid instance where Evans area space is unsuitable for the work being carried out. In this instance, for work on solid state devices, as reported previously, temporary adjustments at a relatively small cost are being made in the semipermanent structure to alleviate this condition.

Additionally the justification of February 1, 1960, stated that failure to provide adequate, contiguous research and development space at Fort Monmouth has retarded the research and development effort in the satellite, missile, nucleonics, and other communications-electronics fields by 3 years. It also stated that the present 9- to 12-year development cycle can be drastically reduced to something less than 5 years if this building is completed. OSD and USASRDL officials advised the staff these latter two conclusions are in error. It was pointed out that to permit scientists and engineers to work in contiguous space as a team should provide for greater efficiency and "feed-back of information" thus resulting in a reduction of the development cycle.

There has been a downward trend in the number of personnel at USASRDL from a high of 14,800 employees in 1943. The original justification for the third increment submitted in 1952 reflected

planned facilities for 4,500 employees. This included three organizational units which have subsequently been separated from USASRDL. The largest of these units was SESA with about 743 employees at the time of separation. USASRDL now has about 3,500 employees. The staff was not advised of any plans for increasing the number of employees in the foreseeable future.

V. Reasonableness of Cost Estimate

The justification dated February 1, 1960, states the total cost of the third and final increment of the Hexagon to be $7,971,000 for 284,350 square feet. This amounts to $28.03 per square foot. The unit cost for building construction alone is reflected on the justification at $25.85.

The staff was advised by officials interviewed that this justification had been carefully reviewed by the Signal Corps, the Office of the Chief of Engineers, and by the various budget review groups of the DOD for accuracy of information and reasonableness of costs.

Despite this assurance, when the staff pursued its inquiry at the New York district office of the Corps of Engineers it was advised that the estimate had been hurriedly prepared, was arrived at through the application of cost-increase factors without being currently priced, and that it included much "fat."

The district office advised that careful estimating at current prices should reduce the unit cost of $28.03 to approximately $22 per square foot.

As a result of the staff's inquiry the district office repriced the work items comprising the estimate, and on March 7, 1960, the Army advised the staff that a revised construction item justification data sheet is being prepared and will be submitted to Congress showing a new total estimated cost of $7,171,000. This will effect a savings of $800,000 over the prior justification.

Comparison of the current working estimates (CWE) for budget purposes, revision No. 1, dated December 14, 1959 (used to support the justification dated February 1, 1960), with the CWE dated March 1, 1960 (after the staff's inquiry into the reasonableness of the cost estimate, is as follows:

Description	CWE, Dec. 14, 1959	CWE, Mar. 1, 1960	Reduction in estimate
Building	$7,350,000	$6,803,000	$547,000
Utilities	161,000	96,000	65,000
Support facilities	259,000	148,000	111,000
Unusual foundation	74,000	48,000	26,000
Site preparation	51,000	0	51,000
Collateral equipment	66,000	66,000	0
Telephone	10,000	10,000	0
Total (excludes design but includes SIOH [1])	7,971,000	7,171,000	800,000
Estimated contract cost	6,691,000	5,858,000	833,000
Telephones	10,000	10,000	0
Contingency reserve	670,000	895,000	−225,000
SIOH	600,000	408,000	192,000
Total estimated cost	7,971,000	7,171,000	800,000

[1] Government supervision, inspection, and overhead.

It should be noted that in recomputing the costs the contingency reserve was raised from $670,000, or 10 percent of the estimated contract cost, to $895,000, or 15.3 percent of the estimated contract cost. The staff cannot account for the need for this increase in the contingency reserve.

Representatives of the Office of the Chief Engineer advised that normally, when estimating, a contingency of 15 percent is provided on preliminary plans and of 5 percent on final plans. The increase of the contingency reserve from 10 percent to 15.3 percent is of questionable validity in light of the facts that construction experience exists on two increments which were substantially similar to the proposed third increment and that the final design of the third increment is 55 percent complete.

Another indication that the contingency reserve figure of $895,000 is questionable is that the New York district engineers, in recomputing the cost estimate, raised the contingency reserve from $670,000 to $1,554,000 which was then arbitrarily reduced to $895,000.

It would appear, therefore, that the December 14, 1959, cost estimate was excessive by $1,025,000 ($800,000 plus $225,000), and that a more realistic total cost estimate is $6,946,000 ($7,971,000 less $1,025,000).

The district engineers furnished the staff with a sketch of work to be done in the third increment. This sketch was originally prepared by an architect-engineer (A. & E.) firm, the Ballinger Co., Philadelphia, Pa., prior to 1956. It was revised December 14, 1959, by the district engineers. The staff noted that this sketch provided for a total of 279,508 square feet in the third increment.

This is to be compared with the 284,350 square feet requested in the justification. This discrepancy was pointed out to the district engineers and upon recomputation by their specialists it was learned that the third increment will consist of a total of 290,864 square feet. On March 1, 1960, the district engineer revised the sketch and current working estimates accordingly.

With the third increment of 290,864 square feet and an estimated cost of $6,946,000 the unit cost would amount to $23.88 per square foot.

The actual cost of the second increment (contract date, April 30, 1953) was $16.20 per square foot. The staff was advised that this very favorable price resulted from the fact that the contractor who got the award was already on the job constructing the first increment. Review of the abstract of bids for the second increment revealed that the bid of the second low bidder would have resulted in a unit cost of $17.47 per square foot.

Since the bid of $17.47 in 1953 represented the lowest bid by a contractor not already on the site, the staff used this figure as a further test of the reasonableness of the cost estimated for the third increment. According to the Corps of Engineers, construction costs have risen on the average of 3 to 5 percent per year since 1953. Assuming a 4-percent-per-year increase, the 1953 bid of $17.47 is equivalent to $22.36 in 1960. This can be compared with an estimated cost of $23.88 (290,864 square feet at a total cost of $6,946,000).

In addition to the foregoing estimated costs, the staff was informed that design costs for the third increment will amount to approximately $322,000 to $350,000. Design costs are funded from the general line item of the military construction appropriation.

53984—60——46

Using the estimate of $7,171,000 for the third increment the total cost of the Hexagon will amount to $21,617,634 detailed as follows:

1st increment: exclusive of design	[1] $5,990,204
Design	[1] 350,285
2d increment: exclusive of design	[1] 7,433,433
Design	[1] 322,712
3d increment: exclusive of design)	[2] 7,171,000
Design	[2] 350,000
Total cost of Hexagon	21,617,634

[1] Actual.
[2] Estimate.

This total cost of $21,617,634 is less than the $22 million estimate made by the Signal Corps in hearings of the House Committee on Appropriations in connection with the request for the second increment in fiscal year 1953. A representative of the Signal Corps pointed out that even though the costs of construction have increased since contracts were let for the first and second increments, it will still be possible to complete the building within the total original estimate.

Much of the construction accomplished in connection with the first and second increments had been planned for the third increment. For example, a total of 665,000 square feet were constructed in the first two increments. This is 54,000 square feet in excess of the square footage planned at the time Congress approved funds for those increments. Another example involves site improvements originally planned as part of the third increment but accomplished at a total cost of approximately $437,000 in 1957 from a residue of first increment funds.

LIST OF WITNESSES

	Page
Allen, Maj. Gen. C. R	284
Bartlett, Comdr. J. V	283, 284, 606
Bridgers, Capt. H. C	283, 606
Burke, Comdr. J. L	283
Butler, Lt. Comdr. D. D	284
Chew, Rear Adm. J. L	283
Connolly, Rear Adm. T. F	283
Cook, Maj. Gen. E. F	1
Driftmier, Lt. Col. J. F	283
Dubber, Col. A. E	284
Ecsi, J. F	641
Ellis, Rear Adm. W. E	283
Ensey, Rear Adm. Lot	283
Evans, Col. G. L., Jr	1, 641
Flanders, Col. E. A	641
Gage, Capt. N. D	284
Gans, Capt. G. M	283
Goldthwaite, Vice Adm. Robert	606
Gray, Comdr. T. R	284
Hanabury, M. R	283, 606
Hastings, Lt. Col. F. W	1
Howard, Lt. Col. C. E	1
Kenyon, A. P	284
Kelt, Benjamin	2
Lee, Lt. Col. L. C	1
Lemmer, C.E	2
Long, Rear Adm. T. A	284
McCarty, Col. R. D	1
Milne, Hon. C. P	283
Minwegen, Comdr. A. P	283
Montgomery, Capt. J. W. M	283
Moore, Lt. Col. L. R	1, 641
Moore, Rear Adm. R. L	283
Muth, Col. R. W	1
Norwood, H. B	2, 641
O'Beirnie, Rear Adm. F	1
Peltier, Rear Adm. E. J	283, 284, 606
Pennington, Col. J. C	1, 641
Pessaud, R. E	284
Reed, J. J	283
Renken, Rear Adm. H. A	606
Rice, Dr. F. A. H	641
Sampson, Col. G. P	1
Seeman, Maj. Gen. L. E	1, 641
Short, Hon. Dewey	1
Smyth, T. J	283
Tiencken, W. P	283, 606
Traub, Maj. Gen. D. W	1
Troth, Col. J. R	1
Van Kuren, H. D	2
Virden, Rear Adm. Frank	284
Vorder-Bruegge, Col. C. F	1
Westenberger, L. A	2, 641
Wyatt, Col. W. O	1

INDEX

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

(Pp. 283–641, inclusive)

A

	Page
Access roads	603
Adak, Alaska, Naval Radio Station	555
Advance land rental	604
Agana, Guam, Naval Air Station	456
Air Force decativated facilities, possible use of	636
Alameda, Calif., Naval Air Station	375
Albany, Ga., Marine Corps Supply Center	489
Annapolis, Md., Naval Academy	508
Annapolis, Md., Naval Radio Station	558
Architect-engineer contracts	311
Argentia, Newfoundland, Naval Station	458
Athens, Ga., Navy Supply Corps School	511
Atsugi, Japan, Naval Air Station	460
Awarding of contracts on noncompetitive basis	310, 311

B

Barber's Point, Oahu, Hawaii, Naval Air Station	378
Barstow, Calif., Marine Corps Supply Center	491
Beaufort, S.C., Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station	436
Bermuda naval facility	352
Budget for 1961	284
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, District of Columbia	483

C

Camp Lejeune, N.C., Marine Corps Base	493
Camp Pendleton, Calif., Marine Corps Base	497
Canal Zone, naval security group activity	583
Capehart housing support	600
Carderock, Md., David Taylor Model Basin	334
Cecil Field, Fla., Naval Air Station	381
Charleston, S.C.:	
Naval degaussing station	384
Naval shipyard	336
Naval station	357
Cheltenham, Naval Radio Station	562
Cherry Point, N.C., Marine Corps Air Station	438
Commodity Credit housing support	603
Communication facilities	553
Concentration of activities in Washington, D.C., area	540, 541, 545, 549
Continuing authorizations	596
Contractor qualifications	311
Correction of inadequate public quarters	602
Cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts	311

D

Dam Neck, Va., Fleet Air Defense Training Center	514
David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Md	334
Disposal of installations	296, 320, 328
District of Columbia, Naval Observatory	359
Dixon, Calif., Naval Radio Station	564

E

Page

El Toro, Calif., Marine Corps Air Station 441
Excess facilities of other services, use of 321, 328

F

Finegayen, Guam, Naval Radio Station 581
Flagstaff, Ariz., Naval Observatory 361
Fleet base facilities 356
Ford Island, Hawaii, Naval Air Station 388
Fort Miles, Del., naval facility 340
Funding of items in 1961 program 295

G

Golcuk, Turkey, Joint U.S. military mission in 372
Great Lakes, Ill., Naval Training Center 519
Guam, Naval Radio Station 579
Guam, public works center 592
Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, Naval Air Station 463

H

Headquarters building 543

I

Inactivation of installations 296, 319, 328
Iwakuni, Japan, Marine Corps air facility 465

J

Jacksonville, Fla., naval air station 390
Johnsville, Pa., naval air development center 447
Joint U.S. military mission, Golcuk, Turkey 370

K

Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii, Marine Corps air station 443
Key West, Fla., Fleet Sonar School 524

L

Lemoore, Calif., naval air station 394

M

Maintenance funds 293
Marine Corps facilities 488
Marine Corps air stations 435
Martin Pena, Puerto Rico, naval radio station 587
Mayport, Fla., naval station 365
Meridian, Miss., naval auxiliary air station (*see also* Naval Air Training Command this index) 606
Metropolitan area, District of Columbia, naval station 516
Minor new construction 598
Miramar, Calif., naval air station 407

N

Naha, Okinawa, naval air facility 467
Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md 508
Naval Air Training Command:
- Corpus Christi complex, workload in 632
- Desirable change in 628
- Excess of facilities in 322
- Meridian, Miss., naval auxiliary air station 606
  - Need for 630
  - Outlying fields in area 623
  - School requirement at 636
  - Status of 624
- Overhaul and repair facilities 622

	Page
Naval Air Training Command—Continued	
Pensacola, Fla.:	
Air congestion in area	625
Outlying fields in area	623
Pilot training load, effect of reduction in	620
Possible closures in	622, 633
Safety record in	626
Training program	615
Naval Observatory, District of Columbia	358
Naval Station, District of Columbia	294
Naval weapons plant	316, 319, 327, 542, 549
Negotiated contracts	310
New Iberia, La., naval air station	618
New London, Conn., Naval Submarine Base	343
New London, Conn., Navy Underwater Sound Laboratory	346
Norfolk, Va., naval supply center	483
North Island, Calif., naval air station	423
O	
Oakland, Calif., naval supply center	486
Obligation of funds	314
Oceana, Va., naval air station	429
P	
Parris Island, S.C., Marine Corps recruit depot	495
Patuxent River, Md., naval air station	450
Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, Naval Submarine Base	349
Pensacola, Fla., Naval Air Training Command. (*See* Naval Air Training Command, this index.)	
Planning and design	605
Plans and specifications completed on projects in 1961 program	295
Pocatello, Idaho, ordnance and weapon plant at	327
Point Mugu, Calif., naval missile center	452
Portsmouth, N.H., Naval Shipyard	350a
Puerto Rico, naval facility	354
Q	
Quantico, Va., Marine Corps School	500
Quonset Point, R.I., naval air station	433
R	
Repair and overhaul of engines, cost of	418
Reprograming	325
Restoration of damaged facilities	599
Roosevelt Roads, P.R., Naval Station	473
Rota, Spain, Naval Station	475
S	
San Diego, Calif., Marine Corps recruit depot	503
San Diego, Calif., Naval Station	368
San Francisco, Calif., Naval Shipyard	350d
San Miguel, Philippine Islands, naval radio facility	589
Service school facilities	507
Shipyard facilities	332
Sigonella, Sicily, naval air facility	478
Skaggs Island, Calif., naval radio station	566
Special-purpose stations	445
Sugar Grove, W. Va., naval radio research station	568
Supply facilities	480
T	
Treasure Island, Calif., Naval Station	370
Turkey, Naval Security Group	585
Twentynine Palms, Calif., Marine Corps Base	505

U

Page
Use of facilities excess to other services 321, 328

W

Wahiawa, Hawaii, naval radio station 572
Washington County, Maine, naval radio station 574
Washington metropolitan area, District of Columbia, naval station 526
Barracks 536
Cost of 544
Freeway, effect of 547
Items planned for construction 552
Weapons facilities 375a
Outside the United States 456
Weapons plant, Washington, D.C 316, 319, 327, 542, 549
Wherry housing, acquisition of 316
Whidbey Island, Wash., naval air station 637
Winter Harbor, Maine, naval security group 577

Y

Yards and docks facilities 592

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

(Pp. 1–282; 641–686, inclusive)

A

Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Md 21
Alternate joint communication system 216
Architect-engineer contracts, award of 14
Army Chemical Center, Md 70
Army Security Agency 94
Overseas 236
Army Support Center, Mo 177
Atlanta General Depot, Ga 59

B

Benecia Arsenal, Calif 33
Blue Grass Ordnance Depot, Ky 35
Brooklyn Army Terminal, N.Y 107

C

Capehart housing 264
Caribbean 223
Chemical Corps 70
Clarksville Base, Tenn 210
Contract awards 10
Corps of Engineers 97

D

Defense Atomic Support Agency 210
Dugway Proving Ground, Utah 74

E

European area 229
Existing facilities, utilization of 45

F

Fifth Army 172
First Army 119
Foreign currency program, special 269
Fort Allen, P.R 223
Fort Belvoir, Va 97
Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind 172
Fort Benning, Ga., Ala., and Fla 133
Fort Bliss, Tex 157

	Page
Fort Bragg, N.C	139
Fort Buchanan, P.R	225
Fort Buckner, Okinawa	220a
Fort Campbell, Ky	145
Fort Detrick, Md	72
Fort Devens, Mass	119
Fort Dix, N.J	121
Fort Eustis, Va	109
Fort George G. Meade, Md	124
Fort Greeley, Alaska	218
Fort Huachuca, Ariz	76
Fort Knox, Ky	271
Fort Leavenworth, Kans	174
Fort Lee, Va	61
Fort Leonard Wood, Mo	187
Fort Lesley J. McNair, D.C	205
Fort Lewis, Wash	189
Fort MacArthur, Calif	190b
Fort McClellan, Ala	148
Fort Monmouth, N.J	80, 672
Army Signal Research and Development Laboratory	672
Hexagon, analysis of proposed addition to	673
Surveys and investigations staff, report of	672
Fort Ord, Calif	191d
Fort Ritchie, Md	131
Fort Rucker, Ala	150
Fort Sill, Okla	163
Forward depot	234
G	
General authorization	260d
K	
Korea	220c
L	
Location 03, Okinawa	236
Location 12, Japan	240
Location 13, England	240b
Location 23	240d
Location 90, Japan	242
Location 177, Korea	244
Location 321, Korea	246
M	
Madigan General Hospital Washington	114
Manpower, personnel, and reserve forces, general statement of	4
Medical	114
Military District of Washington	205
N	
Natick, Mass., Quartermaster Research and Engineering Center (*see also* this subject, this index)	641
National Naval Medical Center, Md	212
New Cumberland General Depot, Pa	63
O	
Ordnance	21
P	
Pacific area	220a
Pacific Scatter System, Japan	250
Picatinny Arsenal, N.J	37
Pirmasens, Germany	229
Presidio of Monterey, Calif	192c

Page

Presidio of San Francisco, Calif 197
Program and requirements, validity of 7
Pueblo Ordnance Depot, Colo 40

Q

Quartermaster Corps 59
Quartermaster Research and Engineering Center, Natick, Mass 641
Animal laboratory 655, 663
Centralization of facilities 657
Chicago:
Activities in 643, 648
Army operation of facilities in 658, 661
Food and container research 646, 660
Illinois Institute of Technology, possible use of 645
Importance of area 654
Controlled storage space 649
Estimates, validity of 647, 665
Food radiation research 650
Housing, availability of 651
Military subsistence supply agency, liaison requirement with 652
Nature of research work 668
Static drop test facilities 649
Technical personnel, source of 655

R

Real property, disposal of 9
Redstone Arsenal, Ala 42
Rents and utilities services 20
Reserve facilities, joint utilization of 11
Richmond Quartermaster Depot, Va 65

S

Salinas training area, Puerto Rico 227
Sandia Base, N. Mex 214
Second Army 124, 271
Sharpe General Depot, Calif 67
Signal Corps 76
Overseas 250
Sixth Army 189
Surface to air missile tactical facilities 254

T

Third Army 133
Transportation Corps 107

U

Umatilla Ordnance Depot, Oreg 50
Unobligated balances 16
U.S. Army, Alaska 218
U.S. Army Logistical Command, Italy 232
U.S. Military Academy, N.Y 207

V

Vint Hill Farms Station, Va 94

W

Walter Reed Army Medical Center 116
Watertown Arsenal, N.Y 52
West Coast Relay and Relay Transmitting Station, Calif 201
White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex 55

Y

Yuma Test Station, Ariz 203

○